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I. Introduction
At the memorial following the attack on his New Zealand mosque, Al Noor Imam Gamal Fouda said, "Terrorism has no color, has no race, and has no religion." But does terror have a political ideology? If so, is it right or left wing?

The Imam also declared the attack "was the result of the anti-Islamic and anti-Muslim rhetoric by some political leaders." Of course, the American media was quick to blame Trump, offering as evidence a selectively edited quote from the killer's deranged manifesto.

In answering the question, "Were/are you a supporter of Donald Trump?" Brenton Tarrant answered, "As a symbol of renewed white identity and common purpose? Sure. As a policy maker and leader? Dear god no." But only the first part of the quote was widely reported, casting a shadow on all those who support Trump only in the latter sense.

Tarrant also identified himself as both left and right wing depending on the definition, as fascist, an eco-fascist in fact, pro-Communist China. He wanted no part of conservatism. He was against mass-immigration of "invaders," warned of low birthrates for European people, and wanted to start a civil war in America by creating conflict between the left and right ideologies over the 2nd Amendment. Despite these complexities, the incident has been classified (at least by the Left) as a far right, Trump-inspired attack.

Now Tarrant himself has inspired the Passover synagogue attack in Poway, California. Assailant John Earnest, a copycat of Robert Bowers' Philadelphia synagogue attack, published his own manifesto in which he said, "I am not a conservative," and denied being a Trump supporter, calling Trump a "Zionist, Jew-loving, anti-White, traitorous [expletive]."

Despite the heavy condemnation of Trump by these mass shooters, a new consensus is emerging that right wing terrorism is the greatest violent extremist threat in America. Multiple sources repeat this assertion, and the notion that white supremacy has grown so popular that it could be the dominant extremist threat might fit with some people's experiences, having witnessed apparent Nazis rallying in Charlottesville, their prolific, hateful online presence and a series of shocking attacks on worshipers. But that "consensus" on "far-right" extremism doesn't fit the Right's own understanding with itself, nor with the reality of terrorist attacks and hate crimes.

The core tenant of right wing ideology is a belief in Constitutionally limited government kept small by design so that individual freedom can flourish. Intricately tied to that goal is the belief in: the right to free expression, the right to bear arms, the sanctity of all life, equality under the law, respect for the armed services and law enforcement, the protection of citizens' rights as the first duty of government, the responsibility of strong civil
society, and the moral and functional superiority of free enterprise over a state-run economy. Nowhere in the political tenants of the right is the belief that one people is better than another, or that violence against civilians is justified for any cause.

This research series first examines the specific data on extremist violence and hate crimes, and shows that 1) extremist incidents are classified as right wing when they are not; 2) non-ideological homicides are being classified as extremist attacks; 3) single or dual victim hate crimes are being measured equally against mass casualty terror attacks; 4) thwarted plots and non-fatal mass casualty events are not being captured in the data; 5) a sharp increase in hate crimes perpetrated by members of the presumed dominant culture is not borne out by the facts, 6) many hate crimes are perpetrated by members of minority groups against other minorities, and 7) a substantial portion of hate crimes are unsolved or lack perpetrator race or ethnicity data.

Next, this series explores the left-wing roots of what are uncritically termed “far-right” movements. and shows how white supremacist, identitarian and ethnonationalist movements conflict with right-wing ideology. They fit instead within a broader context of far-left radicalism and racial collectivism, which are supported by the modern "anti-racist" education model that promotes identity politics and privilege theory over the tried and true "colorblind" model of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Finally, this series looks at global terrorism trends and addresses further areas of research with the goal of reducing political violence and promoting reconciliation.

America is a beautiful country; what she stands for is beautiful and her people are beautiful. She has weathered terrible storms through the decades and she can survive the current polarized climate as well so long as most people want her to survive. The challenge now is for Americans to agree that we want to get along. That, presently, is a tall order.

II. 2018 Extremist Murder Data Misrepresents Right Wing

"Right-Wing Extremism Linked to Every 2018 Extremist Murder in the U.S.,” declared the Anti-Defamation League earlier this year on release of its annual Murder and Extremism report, citing 50 homicides. To arrive at this number, ADL includes incidents that are not right wing in nature and a majority of incidents that are not ideological and/or not planned mass-casualty attacks.

Incredibly, ADL categorizes three Moorish sovereign citizen homicides as right wing: Tiierre Guthrie (pictured above), Malachi Qaadir Dorns, and Demetrius Alexander Brown. As with many of ADL’s “right wing extremists,” none of the three engaged in premeditated assaults. Brown is charged with killing an acquaintance after an automobile purchase dispute involving fraud, Dorns has been ruled incompetent to stand trial for killing his brother in a domestic dispute, and Guthrie killed a police officer while resisting arrest for a failure to appear warrant in a traffic case. According to a 2014 Department of Homeland Security report, "Although most organizations group Sovereign Citizens with other right wing groups, they are quite unique...Their anti-government ideology is arguably more akin to left wing anarchists than right wing Klansmen."

There is also more crossover between Moorish sovereign citizens and black nationalist, black supremacist and black Islamic groups, than with right-wing ideology. According to Southern Poverty Law Center there are more black nationalist groups (264 in 2018) than white nationalist groups (148 in 2018), and such extremists figured prominently in ADL's 2016 Murder and Extremism report after Micah Xavier Johnson killed five police officers in Dallas and Gavin Eugene Long killed three police officers in...
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Baton Rouge. While ADL properly listed both Johnson and Long as black nationalist extremists, SPLC inexplicably listed them in its *Terror on the Right* report.

ADL’s 2017 report included Kori Ali Muhammad as a black nationalist who targeted whites and killed four people in Fresno. However, ADL did not mention that Muhammad yelled "Allahu Akbar" when taken into custody, and did not acknowledge any link to Islamic extremism. In contrast, a fatal stabbing by Islamic convert Corey Johnson was categorized as Islamic extremist but also as “right wing-related,” such that ADL’s press release claimed right-wing extremism was linked to every 2018 extremist murder, period. Johnson, who had an interest in violent dictators, including Hitler, converted to Islam, reached out to ISIS, and posted social media threats. The FBI was preparing charges against Johnson when he fatally stabbed a 13-year-old and wounded two others at a sleepover; he told investigators he did it “because of his Muslim faith.”

Looking at the four most deadly incidents ADL cites from 2018, accounting for 34 deaths, we find other dubious right wing attributions and two that were deemed non-ideological in nature.

- **Robert Bowers**, who is charged with killing 11 people at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, was categorized as right wing, but the assumption that anti-Semitism has a greater home on the Right than the Left is incorrect, as evidenced by the *Canary Mission’s* watch-site on anti-Semitism on campuses. Of roughly 2,500 individuals listed, all but a couple dozen are clearly left-leaning or Arab. Former friends and coworkers said Bowers was conservative and anti-global government, but not anti-Semitic or full of hate when they knew him. Leading up to the shooting, Bowers was explicitly anti-Trump, whom he considered to be a globalist controlled by Jews. The *New York Times* recent anti-Semitic editorial cartoon likewise showed Trump controlled by Netanyahu.

- Parkland school shooter Nikolas Cruz, who confessed to taking 17 lives, is reported to have had racist, anti-Semitic and white supremacist sentiments, but his attack was deemed non ideological by ADL: "little evidence has so far emerged to suggest that the [Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School] shooting spree itself was conducted as a white supremacist attack." Based on the indiscriminate choice of victims, mental illness, anti-depressants, school shooting copycat obsession and violent video games are likely far more relevant factors than Cruz's apparent support for Trump, much less any understanding of right wing ideology.

- Travis Reinking has been ruled incompetent to stand trial for the murders of four people at the Nashville Waffle House. Reinking's incident is listed as non-ideological but categorized as right wing solely because he told had people in the past that he was a sovereign citizen. Mental illness was again a bigger factor than political ideology of any kind.

- **Scott Paul Beierle**, who took two lives in the Florida hot yoga attack, had no known political affiliation but is categorized as right wing solely because he told had people in the past that he was a sovereign citizen. Mental illness was again a bigger factor than political ideology of any kind.

Of the remaining 10 incidents accounting for 13 homicides, only four incidents resulting in one homicide each, were ideological. The other seven
homicides were the result of personal disputes or crimes in which ideology was incidental to the crime. "Ideological motives appear to have played a primary or secondary role in 19 of the 50 extremist murders," notes the ADL. Indeed, the New America Foundation, which also tracks such incidents, only lists 16 extremist murders for 2018, 11 of which came from Bowers, and one from Islamic convert Johnson.

The inclusion of non-ideological incidents by ADL begs the question of whether all murders committed by non-whites are being examined as intensely for potential extremist views and affiliations held by the assailants. Some non-ideological, person-dispute murders were listed as right wing extremism on the basis of former prison gang affiliation or tattoos alone. The same level of scrutiny should then be made for other murders around the country; currently it is not.

III. Islamic Extremism Under-Counted in Terror Data

Despite an all-encompassing view of "far-right" extremism to include non-ideological and often single-victim homicides, organizations reporting on terrorism systematically under-count the threat of Islamic extremists. Left out of the data are thwarted plots, lone wolf and non-fatal mass-casualty events, and more.

The New America Foundation and Government Accounting Office offer statistics comparing fatal "far-right" to "Islamic-inspired" incidents in America, after September 11, 2001. Leaving off those 3,000 homicides, far-right extremists are said to be responsible for the majority of incidents, while Islamic extremists are responsible for the majority of deaths. New America cites 13 jihadi incidents for 104 deaths, compared to 40 "far-right" incidents for 87 deaths through April, 2019. The GAO cites 23 Islamic-inspired incidents for 119 deaths, compared to 62 "far-right" incidents for 106 deaths through 2016.

On the face of it, Islamic terror is far-deadlier than whatever qualifies as "right-wing" terror. So what does qualify for each?

The Beltway sniper attack did not make it into New America's count but represented 15 separate deadly incidents in the GAO report. Professor Andrew Holt of Florida State University found at least 5 other incidents that were left out of New America's numbers. Both GAO and New America exclude most lone wolf Islamic attacks because their methodology only counts assailants who worked on behalf of al-Qaeda, ISIS or another known terrorist organization.

The Religion of Peace website attempts to offer more complete numbers, showing 53 Islamic extremist incidents resulting in 158 deaths and 503 people wounded. Included in those figures are 20 attacks that failed to kill anyone (except the assailant), all but two of which resulted in injuries.

The inclusion of wounded data is critically important for understanding the severity of the threat. In New America and GAO accounts, the Boston Marathon bombing represents only four deaths -- not the 265 horrendous casualties that occurred, and the Somali-born Ohio State University student's car attack and stabbing spree doesn't count at all because the 11 people wounded all survived.

In contrast to the limited methodological restrictions for Islamic terror, "far-right" assailants need no affiliation but are included based on the reporting organization's subjective assessment of their ideologies, even when their murders are non-ideological, e.g. the murder of a drug dealer or four separate murders of sex offenders. Even the ideological murders classified as "far-right" -- largely hate crimes, including prison murders -- typically targeted one or two victims rather than crowds of people. Only four of the 62 incidents classified by the GAO as far-right resulted in more than two deaths. As reprehensible as hate crimes are, they are of a different order of magnitude compared to terror
attacks.

The FBI does not even include a way to report Arab ethnicity for hate crime offenders -- it added that option for victims only -- despite the potential for anti-Semitic or anti-LGBT attacks (like the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando). Nor does any public agency track honor killings. Try as they might, even Religion of Peace, under-counts these Islamic-inspired fatalities.

Multiple thwarted Islamic terror plots are also not represented in the data. Recently, such alleged attacks included: a bomb plot in Los Angeles in April 2019; a truck attack in Maryland in March 2019, a plot to target law enforcement and military discovered at a New Mexico compound in 2018, an alleged Cleveland Fourth of July truck bomb plot in 2018; an alleged Texas mall mass-shooting plot in 2018; an alleged San Francisco Pier 39 bomb and mass-shooting plot in 2018; an alleged Miami mall bomb plot in 2017; and an alleged international plot brought down in New Jersey, to bomb and conduct mass-shootings against high population targets in New York City in 2016.

The Heritage Foundation documents all Islamic terror plots -- both those that are carried out and those averted -- and lists 109 planned Islamic attacks on America since September 11, 2001.

The dramatic difference in deadliness and number of lives affected, as reflected in casualties, shows that the GAO and New America are comparing apples to oranges when they cast a wide net for "far right" hate crimes and non-ideological homicides, while taking the most narrow view of Islamic terror possible and leaving off thwarted mass killing plots entirely. When all the data is examined, it is misleading to suggest that "right wing extremism" is the dominant threat faced by America.

IV. Hate Crimes “Refuse to Conform to an Easy Narrative”

Americans have been told of the uptick in hate crimes since President Trump campaigned and took office, but the facts tell a different story. Long-term data shows a decline in hate incidents, and many hate crimes don't fit the stereotype of whites targeting minorities.

Much has been made of a 17 percent reported rise in hate crimes based on FBI data from 2016 to 2017 -- the third straight year of increase! But the earlier increase was only slight (a 3 percent rise from 2013 through 2016), while the bulk of the change happened when 1,000 more law enforcement agencies submitted data.

Though not at an all-time low, hate crimes have trended downward over the long term: 8,049 hate incidents in 1997, down to 7,624 in 2007, down to 7,175 in 2017. More jurisdictions participated over time however, most of which had no hate crimes to report: 85 percent of the 11,211 agencies reported zero hate crimes in 1997; 85 percent of 13,241 agencies reported zero hate crimes in 2007; and 87 percent of 16,149 agencies reported zero hate crimes in 2017.

"The Social Construction of a Hate Crime Epidemic," published in the Winter 1996 Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, found an alleged epidemic did not exist then either, but it argued media outlets, politicians and advocacy group have vested interests in convincing Americans otherwise. The authors warned, "[T]his pessimistic and alarmist portrayal of a divided conflict-ridden community may create a selffulfilling prophesy and exacerbate societal divisions."

Two decades later hate crimes still exist, but "the reality of hate crimes doesn’t always fit the archetype of white, straight, Christian, mostly male bigots terrorizing racial, sexual or religious minorities...." wrote Cathy Young for The Bulwark. She noted that black people, making up 13 percent of the U.S. population, were over-represented as victims (30 percent of total incidents), but also as offenders (23 percent).

Regarding a surge in violently anti-Semitic
attacks in the Crown Heights neighborhood in Brooklyn, the New York Times candidly admitted, "If anti-Semitism bypasses consideration as a serious problem in New York, it is to some extent because it refuses to conform to an easy narrative with a single ideological enemy. During the past 22 months, not one person caught or identified as the aggressor in an anti-Semitic hate crime has been associated with a far right-wing group...."

Three months later, the Times got a bit more to the point, "Rabbi Eli Cohen, the executive director of the Crown Heights Jewish Community Council, has begun visiting nearby public schools with Geoffrey Davis, an African-American community leader, to try to understand what may be driving the [anti-Semitic] attacks, as many of the assailants arrested by the police have been young men of color."

In the Community Security Service report on anti-Semitic attacks from 1969 through 2016, Yehudit Barskey tracks two major anti-Semitic threats: white supremacist and radical Islamic ideologies. While the media and most advocacy groups focus almost exclusively on the former, the mere mention of the latter borders on taboo, leaving the problem shrouded in mystery.

FBI hate crime reporting does not even include the category of Arab as a potential perpetrator -- it was added only as a victim category. The Canary Mission campus watch website offers a rare glimpse into the widespread problem of anti-Semitic bias among Arab students. Certainly the FBI should attempt to track potential bias crimes in this regard.

But as Barskey's report reminds -- and New York's anti-Semitic incidents may reflect -- radical Islamic ideologies also include "black Muslims," known as the Nation of Islam: "a pseudo-Islamic, African-American nationalist, anti-white and anti-Semitic movement."

According to Southern Poverty Law Center, anti-LGBT sentiments are also prevalent in Nation of Islam and other black nationalist groups, which are on the rise.

Like anti-Semitic crimes, recent anti-LGBT incidents shatter the narrative of straight, white perpetrators. Last month in Dallas, a mob assault on a transgender woman, perpetrated by African-Americans, was caught on video. And in 2016, a white bisexual New York man was convicted of the hate-crime murder of a gay man, whom prosecutors say the killer was jealous of for being openly gay.

The complexities of hate crimes demonstrate the need to set aside assumptions and improve perpetrator data collection. In 2017, about 1 in 5 incidents were listed as unknown race, more than half were unknown ethnicity, and almost a third were unknown suspect. Even known suspect information may be wrong as it can be based solely on the word of the victim. Remember, Jussie Smollett's case would have been listed as known white assailants had his crime not been exposed as a hoax.

V. “Trump-Inspired” versus Anti- Trump Violence

Americans on the Left and Right appear to be coexisting in parallel universes. On one side of the spectrum, "Trump-inspired" violence against minorities is at crisis levels; patriotic speech, MAGA hats and American flags are literal violence; public gatherings must be shut down; and initiating assaults on "Nazis" is not only justified, it is a civic duty. The view from across the aisle, however, is that Trump has not called for violence, First Amendment rights are for everyone, and the Left's harassment, assault and intimidation campaign against half the country borders on terrorism.

In October 2018, The Intercept's Medi Hassan offered a list of "Trump-inspired" violence that included a dozen events going back four years. "It would be wrong, of course, to blame Trump alone for these attacks," he allowed. "Many of these
alleged attackers have mental health issues; quite a few of them were also men of violence, intolerance, and bigotry long before Trump launched his political career. To pretend, however, that the president has nothing to do with these violent criminals or their violent crimes is absurd."

To blame the President at all for the acts of mentally ill individuals, some of whom adamantly opposed Trump or supported other candidates, is what's absurd. When the President points out the problems of radical Islamic terror, multiple migrant caravans approaching the Southern border, the influx of drugs, human trafficking, or criminals, terrorists and cartel members hiding among refugees, it is not bigotry or a call to violence, it's his job.

Hassan also charged that his list of Trump-inspired violence was weighed against just one left-inspired attacker: James Hodgkinson who shot Republican legislators at baseball practice. That also is wrong.

Breitbart documented more than 600 anti-Trump attacks and threats of violence over less than two years from the inauguration through November 2018. They included:

- Fatal shootings in Atlanta and Pennsylvania, and a third shooting in Ohio;
- An assassination attempt in Nevada;
- Shots fired at GOP headquarters in Florida, at a truck flying a MAGA flag in Indiana, and at a Trump golf course in Florida;
- A threat to commit a mass shooting at a MAGA event at Trump International Hotel in D.C.;
- A livestreamed assault in Chicago in which a mentally disabled teen was held captive for almost two days, bound, gagged, threatened, abused and forced to make negative statements about Trump;
- A woman's hair set on fire at a protest;
- A Chicago crowd witnessing the beating of a presumed Trump supporter after an election-time traffic altercation, cheered on, "Don't vote Trump," and "Yeah, it's one of them white boy Trump guys."
- A frequent Republican protester charged with "attempted possession of radioactive material with intent to cause death."
- Brutal assaults of women, teenagers, the elderly and others.

The Political Insider sorted through the list and found that sixty anti-Trump attacks were against females or minorities. Far from being widely denounced, fifty-four of the anti-Trump incidents were calls for violence from members of the media, politicians or celebrities.

Since Breitbart stopped updating their list, attacks on Trump supporters have continued, with numerous cases of harassment and assault against individuals wearing Make America Great Again hats, including reported cases in Maryland, San Antonio, Oklahoma, Tucson, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Kansas, Kentucky.

Red State's Jeff Charles warned against adopting leftist terminology to label such assaults hate crimes ("The thoughts one holds in their minds does not have any bearing on the severity of the crime they are committing"). Instead, he argued, assaults on Trump supporters fit the definition of terrorism: the use of criminal violence to intimidate or coerce a civilian population or the government, i.e., political violence.

Last month, a now-deleted tweet for the CBS drama, The Good Fight included a list of "target words" with a note asking if viewers caught the "Easter Egg" reference to an episode. One column started with the words, "Assassinate" and "President" and "Trump," while the second column started with "Eliminate" and "Mar-a-
Lago."

A second, now-deleted tweet featured a video promoting the new season of The Good Fight, in which a character justified political violence. In the clip, a man walks through a protest, saying, "Some speech requires a more visceral response." The Overton Window of acceptable opinions is maintained by enforcement, he argued. "So yeah, this is enforcement. It's time to punch a few Nazis."

**VI. Far-Left Connection to the So-Called “Far-Right”**

Analyses of white supremacist and fascist movements are driven by left-leaning individuals whose first goal -- beyond understanding or defusing them -- is to place the phenomena in the right wing camp, thereby stigmatizing the entire Right through guilt by association. But fascism was an outgrowth of socialism, and the modern "Third Position" fascist movement's synergy with far-left activists reinforces the fact that it still belongs on the far-left of the current political spectrum.

Giovanni Gentile, known as the philosopher of fascism, was strongly influenced by Hegel and Marx. "Giovanni Gentile believed that there were two diametrically opposed types of democracy," explains Dinesh D'Souza. "One is liberal democracy, such as that of the United States, which Gentile dismisses as individualistic, too centered on liberty and individual rights -- and therefore selfish. The other, the one Gentile recommends, is 'true democracy,' in which individuals willingly subordinate themselves to the state." D'Souza argues:

"For Gentile, fascism is a form of socialism, indeed, its most workable form. While the socialism of Marx mobilizes people on the basis of class, fascism mobilizes people by appealing to their national identity as well as their class. **Fascists are socialists with a national identity** [emphasis added]."

Whereas right wing ideology seeks to limit government so that individual liberty and markets can flourish, the modern progressive Left seeks to "place the resources of the individual and industry in the service of a centralized state," for various goals, D'Souza points out. His 2017 book, "The Big Lie: Exposing the Nazi Roots of the American Left," shows the long history of Democrat-Fascist interplay -- how America's pro-slavery, pro-segregation, eugenicist Democratic Party inspired Hitler, who in turn inspired later Democrats.

The Left has steadfastly refused to acknowledge the philosophically socialist spawning ground of fascism, pointing out only that fascism differs from socialism, and from democratic socialism, in particular. Yet they fail to make the case that fascism is more closely aligned with an individualistic, small government philosophy as one would expect at the far-right end of the right wing, such as anarcho-capitalism.

When leftist dogma on fascism is challenged, the political interpretation of right wing is quickly supplanted with a psychological one, such that people on the right seem to be more uptight and therefore, Q.E.D., fascist. Even the psychological analysis fails, however; it ignores that Hitler was a Bohemian occultist, and predictably misinterprets the Right as well.

Americans are supposed to believe that in the center is some moderate amount of government, with smaller government promoted the farther right you move on the spectrum until suddenly, and inexplicably, you switch to totalitarianism. While larger government is advocated for various causes (collectivism), the farther left you move on the spectrum until you find self-styled "anarchists" who champion a revolutionary dismantling of government, but with anarchism typically conceived only as a temporary state followed by various forms of socialism or totalitarian communism. In reality, this far-far-left edge is where fascism has its home.
The Modern Far-Left-Fascist Convergence

A look at the modern far-left and "Third Position" fascist movements demonstrates their deep kinship. Southern Poverty Law Center struggled to comprehend this dynamic in, "Battle in Seattle Brings Left and Right Wing Zealots Together," published in 2000 just after the World Trade Organization riots against globalism: "How was it that members of the far 'left' and 'right' found themselves facing down police together? In the answers to these questions may lie the shape of future American extremism," Southern Poverty foreshadowed.

SPLC described what they saw as a far-left-right convergence in America and Britain, with anti-capitalist, deep ecology, and neo-Pagan characteristics. What SPLC considered far-right, however, would be unrecognizable to most people on the actual Right:

"The radical right has added other ideas into the mix. More and more, its ideologues applaud the actions of terrorist groups like the Animal Liberation Front and sometimes violent 'deep ecologists' like those in Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front, which claimed the $12 million arson of a Vail, Colo., ski resort in 1998. They support the 'national liberation' struggles of countries with terrorist histories like Iraq and Libya. They cheer black groups like the Nation of Islam.”

Members of the far-left-proper noted a striking dynamic too: they were being courted by fascists. In the 2002 essay, "Facism and Anti-Facism," posted to the ItsGoingDown Antifa website, Don Hamerquist warned of "a militantly anti-capitalist brand of fascism" that sought converts not from the right, but from the militant, anti-capitalist, revolutionary left:

"The left had better begin to deal with the fact that issues that are regarded a part of our movement: 'globalization', working class economic demands, 'green' questions, resistance to police repression etc. are now being organized by explicit fascists.... Some of the fascists take positions that at least appear to be much more categorically oppositional [to capitalism] than those of most of the left....[many of these] fascists explicitly aim to recruit from the ranks of the left."

Like SPLC, Hamerquist pointed to potential far left-fascist convergence surrounding ecology, but also racial identity. "[Neo-fascists] argue that their support of white separatism entails that they also recognize the right of other peoples to their own nations and cultures. Some of them deny that they are white supremacists at all..." wrote Hamerquist. He explained that white and non-white fascist groups could form partnerships with one another, and that American Front claimed they already had.

Southern Poverty showed race was incorporated into a larger view of ecology in fascism. The "green-brown alliance," SPLC explained, was "a fusion with a long history" going back to the ecologically-minded Nazis and before. What's more, there is some fertile ground to appeal to modern environmentalists on racial issues. SPLC noted that in 1998, 40 percent of the Sierra Club membership voted to declare both legal and illegal immigration to be an environmental ill, and EarthFirst! founder David Foreman once described the Ethiopian famine as "nature's population control."

The far-left were generally found to be more sympathetic to fascist overtures than those identified as right wing, SPLC reported:

"[I]t seems clear that the hard right will draw increasingly from the ranks of its former enemies. 'The radical Left has much more potential to produce true Revolutionaries than the Right,' the [American Front's James] Porazzo says. 'We're seeing more Leftists coming to the Revolution and American Front than I ever dreamed possible. These comrades have, generally, been able to grasp [our] ideas much, much quicker than the ex-Rightists... ."
Just a few years later, in a 2008 article on "national anarchism," Spencer Sunshine reported on some continuing success in building the radical-left-fascist alliance:

"Over the years, the antiglobalization movement has also created an opening for these Left Right alliances...At the same time, parts of the anti-imperialist Left (including many anarchists) have built alliances with reactionary Islamist movements such as Hamas and Hezbollah, called for open acceptance of antisemitism, and embraced nationalist [sic]. This history prompts many cosmopolitan anarchists to worry that the overtures of newstyle fascists to radical Leftists could meet with some success. [emphasis added]."

Beyond varying degrees of synergy over anti-capitalism, ecology, racial identity, neo-Paganism and anti-Semitism, the far-left-fascist convergence shares a "by any means necessary" mentality to advance their goals above all other considerations -- the mark of extremism.

VII. Paradigm Breakdown at Fringe Civil War in Charlottesville

Trump was pilloried after the tragic 2017 "Unite the Right" rally, for refusing to parrot the narrative that all rally-goers were violent racists while all counter-protesters were non-violent demonstrators. But a closer look at Charlottesville does, in fact, reveal a much deeper story: one of left-influenced Nazis and a diverse set of militias in attendance.

Three high profile individuals from the rally demonstrate on a personal level, the fringe left backgrounds of those who are now described uncritically as part of the fringe right. Southern Poverty Law Center reports that rally organizer Jason Kessler himself was a former Obama supporter and part of the Occupy Movement. [Kessler was part of the "Alt-Right" contingent at the rally, discussed below. The focus here is on the explicitly white supremacist faction. Both factions have strong leftist ties.]

Rally attendee and League of the South representative Garon Archer was once a card-carrying communist. Two weeks after the rally, Knox News reported that Archer had previously railed against the "far-right" in his writings for the Communist Party in 2014, and in 2012, protested the RNC and attended an Occupy Movement protest of the Treyvon Martin shooting in which he chanted anti-racist slogans and burned a Confederate bandanna.

Both Kessler and Archer had switched from far left to what is presumed to be far right, essentially swinging around the back side of the political spectrum, as it is understood, without ever actually entering mainstream right ideology.

Fringe left ideology can also be seen in rally attendee Matthew Heimbach, former chairman of the now disbanded neo-Nazi Traditionalist Workers Party. As the Workers Party name connotes, Heimbach was critical of capitalism. In a Vice interview after the rally, Heimbach was quoted to say:

"The left wasn’t able to beat us, the left who are the good boys of the capitalist class and the bourgeoisie and the status quo, so they weren’t able to beat us with their armed militant left wing radicals, so they had to turn to the state. If that doesn’t go to show that the radical left and the corporations and the state are all on the same Jewish side, a moment like this proves it."

Significantly, Heimbach is anti-Israel and a supporter of Hamas, Hezbollah and "all Arab groups" -- a position also common on the far left.

Strange Bedfellows

Both the far left and what is termed far right have attracted nationwide concern for their embrace of a militarized culture that promotes revolutionary change. After the Charlottesville rally, members of the extreme left and right alike were sued by the city for operating as paramilitary forces.

The armed and militant branches of Antifa --
Redneck Revolt and the Socialist Rifle Association -- were named in the suit along with other paramilitary groups on the protesters' side, all of which claimed to be there to protect those in attendance.

Speaking for a Constitutionalist militia, Pennsylvania Light Foot's Christian Yingling told Rewire News:

"We didn’t agree with any of the groups out there that day, not one of them. We were out there for the First Amendment of the Constitution... None of my people ever pointed a weapon at anyone. All they did was do the police’s job when they stopped doing it."

However, at least one Redneck Revolt member, University of North Carolina professor Dwayne Dixon, admitted he directly engaged with James Fields, Jr., prior to Fields driving into another car that hit a group of protesters, killing Heather Heyer. As Gateway Pundit reported, Dixon said that he chased Fields' car with a rifle just before the tragedy.

On January 7, 2018, apparently dismayed by a Spike's Tactical tweet earlier in the day that read, "Not today ANTIFA...not today," Dixon posted a picture of himself with his rifle boasting:

"I take perverse pleasure in having carried this Spike’s lower [receiver and trigger assembly] in the defense of Justice Park on August 12th.

I used this rifle to chase off James Fields from our block of 4th St before he attacked the marchers to the south."

[emphasis added]

Dixon was charged with assault on a Big League Politics reporter at Charlottesville, and in a separate instance, Dixon was charged with "going armed to the terror of the people and bringing a weapon to a downtown demonstration" for bringing a semi-automatic weapon to a rumored KKK rally in Duram that never materialized. The charges were dropped.

The one-sided media portrayal of a violent "far right" rally met by peaceful protest did not match the facts. Long before Dixon's admission came out, the President and others were aware of the violence that many counter-protesters engaged in at Charlottesville. Trump dared to ask reporters, “What about the alt-left that came charging at the, as you say, the alt right? Do they have any semblance of guilt?”

Trump made special note of the fact that counter-protesters did not have a permit. Their decision to operate outside the law, often initiating violence and determined to block the rights of others to free speech and assembly, reflects the radical left's By Any Means Necessary ethos when it comes to advancing their agenda.

It is the willingness to engage in political violence that is a real source of concern for any extremist movement, and in the case of Charlottesville, it was counter-protesters who stepped outside the law, in battle with fascists, their neighbors to the left on the ideological spectrum.

VIII. “Alt-Right” Rallied on Statues, Speech – Not Supremacy

Despite the name, the "Unite the Right" rally at Charlottesville was not a mainstream right event. It was organized by white identitarians, who often self-describe as Alt Right, and opposed the removal of historic statues and the systematic shut-down of conservative gatherings.

Many non-extremists oppose the removal of statues -- statues of the pro-slavery Democrats as it were -- on principle: to them the erasure of history smacks of the Communist China Cultural Revolution that followed Mao Zedong's failed Great Leap Forward. After the rally, Trump asked reporters the important question on statue removal: “Where does it end?” He questioned, “Are we going to take down statues of George Washington? How about Thomas Jefferson? ...You're changing history, you're changing culture.”
“Far-Right” Extremism Examined, by Angela Eckhardt

Statues and free speech were central to the rally, and it was the people rallying on these issues, together with those counter-protesters who were peacefully opposing racism, to whom the president referred when he said there were good people on both sides at Charlottesville. Trump explicitly denounced violence on both sides, and denounced racism, saying,

“Racism is evil and those who cause violence in its name are criminals and thugs, including the KKK, neo-Nazis, white supremacists and other hate groups that are repugnant to everything we hold dear as Americans.”

-- Donald J. Trump

Many conservatives kept their distance from Charlottesville because they oppose identitarianism at least as much as they oppose statue removal and conservative censorship. The Proud Boys, who regularly provide security for conservative speakers, were ordered not to attend Unite the Right by the club's founder Gavin McInnes. Nevertheless, SPLC still charges that the Proud Boys helped organize the rally. The Proud Boys, on the other hand, say they were unsuccessfully infiltrated by Unite the Right rally organizer Jason Kessler, who misrepresented himself by denying he was Alt Right, and was subsequently banned. Proud Boys bylaws ban white nationalists, white supremacists, or Alt-Right men from membership.

In the aftermath of the rally, some members of the Alt Right were interviewed by Breitbart and unanimously condemned the violence as well as the police handling that put protesters and counter-protesters in direct contact with each other. They also categorically denied Nazi, KKK and white supremacist labels and said the Alt Right contingent outnumbered those groups at least two-to-one. This assessment of numbers fits within the SPLC's findings that groups like the KKK and neo-Nazis have been on the decline for years, while what the SPLC terms “white nationalists” and the “Alt Right” are on the rise.

Like the Proud Boys, Breitbart is a frequent critic of the Alt Right while still being branded as part of it. The news outlet explains that their former executive Steve Bannon's "platform of the alt-right" quote stemmed from the murky and conflicting understandings of the term as the movement has come into being. Bannon used the term in 2016 to describe nationalists, and has explicitly rejected ethnonationalism and white supremacism. Just days after the Charlottesville rally, Breitbart cheered a Harvard-MIT study finding that Breitbart itself is not Alt Right.

A year later, only about two dozen people attended an anniversary Unite the Right rally, during which organizer Jason Kessler advocated for white civil rights, but denied white nationalism or supremacy:

"I'm not a white nationalist...I'm okay with sharing this country with people from around the world, but if you bring in too many people at once, it's not the same country anymore."

-- Jason Kessler, Unite the Right organizer

"A lot of folks are deliberately misconstruing white identity politics today as something that's endorsing the KKK or neo-Nazis...," Kessler said and noted the problem of Alt-Right offensive jokes that lampoon racism, saying, "We gotta be honest. We gotta be sincere. There is a way forward to help white folks but we cannot be associating with hate or violence or oppression."

Who is the Alt Right?
Statistician Zach Goldberg has compiled data from a 2018 Washington Post / Keiser Family Foundation poll that shows very few people of either major party consider themselves alt right or white nationalist: about 2 percent of Democrats, 3 percent of Republicans, and 6 percent Independent. Interestingly, more blacks (6 percent) and Hispanics (5 percent) considered themselves part of the Alt Right / white nationalist movement compared to only 2 percent of whites, and though this finding was not statistically significant it may reflect the fact that many people understand these ill-defined terms differently.
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The term Alt Right was developed by Paul Gottfried and his colleague Richard Spencer to be a catch-all phrase describing right-affiliated individuals at odds with the conservative establishment, including paleoconservatives (defined in opposition to neoconservatives), libertarians, and white nationalists. During the 2016 election, many individuals in the first two camps picked up the designation before they'd ever heard of Spencer or understood that the term was developed by white identitarians and would soon only be defined as such.

Spencer attained the national spotlight when he raised his glass saying, “Hail Trump,” at a 2016 National Policy Institute conference -- prompting stiff-armed salutes from some audience members. The paleoconservative and libertarian camps quickly jumped ship, categorically denouncing the Alt Right, but leftist critics of the Right were loathe to let them leave.

“The study of right-wing extremism has usually been the domain of avowed opponents, and has led largely to opinionated, speculative, emotional, and highly politicized studies in the field,” wrote University of Georgia Professor Cas Mudde in his 1996 overview of research into the extreme right. An abstract states, ”This analysis shows a more differentiated picture of the ideology of this ‘party family’, and is a warning against too careless generalisations.”

Alt Right analyses suffer from this same bias according to the 2017 Lancaster University Masters in Politics dissertation into the emerging movement by Eleanor Kate Newton (who also was not an Alt Right fan). The question of whether to accept the Alt Right moniker as denoting anything distinct from historic neo-Nazi and white supremacist movements is hotly debated, with Newton and others concluding it is distinct, while Mudde now joins the SPLC, ADL and others to insist it is just a clever rebranding and to recognize it as anything different would serve to sanitize and legitimate a racist ideology.

In keeping with the latter assessment, a Google Chrome Extension was made available in November 2016, to change all instances of the term “Alt-Right” to “white supremacy.” An updated version “auto-corrects” Alt Right to “neo-Nazi.” Though the extension is marketed under the title, “Stop Normalizing The Alt Right,” it may instead serve to normalize racism -- vastly inflating the numbers of actual racists -- through this reductionist view of an amorphous movement, coupled with the drive to label an ever-increasing number of right-affiliated individuals with the Alt Right moniker.

IX. The Right Rejects Alt-Right, and Normies Still Don't Get it

As with fascism and white supremacy, the so-called "Alt Right" white identitarian movement is not part of right wing ideology. Rather, it is an outgrowth of, and inevitable reaction to, left wing identity politics.

In his 2016 speech, "How to Destroy the Alt Right," Milo Yiannopoulos offered important insights into the movement. "Just to be clear, I don’t consider myself a member of the alt-right," he said, noting major points of disagreement such as his support for Israel. He continued,

"[T]here are racists in the alt-right — but the movement is much bigger than just them. The left’s motivations in branding the alt-right as skinheads with Twitter accounts are easier to understand when you realize that the left is responsible for creating it in the first place...

The problem is, they’re smearing an entire political generation as racist, and they don’t care who gets hurt in the process...I see two primary motivating factors behind the rise of the alt right. The first is a millenarian generation that’s fed up with identity politics and its hypocrisies.... The second is anti-white racism."

-- Milo Yiannopoulos

Though many on the Right understand this frustration they shun the white identitarian...
movement because the Right shuns the racial collectivism of identity politics. Instead, right wing ideology promotes meritocracy.

"The key question behind all this is: are we going to have identity politics for everyone, or identity politics for no-one? At the moment, we have identity politics for everyone except white men. I’d prefer we had no identity politics at all and that we judged people, as someone once said, not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

-- Milo Yiannopoulos

The white identitarian movement will likely grow as long as the politics of victimhood and pride in one's ethnicity and heritage is accepted and even encouraged throughout academia and the broader country, for everyone except white people. That hypocrisy can easily engender resentment and conspiracy theories regarding the cause of anti-white bias. Add to this identitarian problem the fact that many now consider Alt Right to be synonymous with white supremacy, neo-Nazi and anti-Semitic, and you have a movement that few people want to call their own.

Despite the Left's disgust with all things remotely Alt Right affiliated, and the assessment that the term shouldn't even be used, it is remarkably hard for anyone to opt out of the movement. No amount of disavowal of the Alt Right, from groups like Breitbart and the Proud Boys to individual personalities up to and including the president himself, has satisfied the Left. Some have tried a different approach, and adopted the term "Alt Light" to represent opposition to establishment conservatism while explicitly condemning racism and anti-Semitism, with no better outcome.

One of the most visible white identitarian groups on college campuses, Identity Evropa, disbanded in March to form a new group called American Identity Movement under the leadership of Patrick Casey, who took over Identity Evropa after Charlottesville. Beyond the defense of whiteness, AIM's primary objectives are to oppose mass immigration, globalization, and foreign intervention while promoting protectionist trade and populism.

Anti-globalization is now treated by many on the left as a dog-whistle for anti-Semitism, though there is not a hint of anti-Semitism on the AIM site. Others who are anti-Semitic may want to align with AIM for public relations reasons, but that need not define AIM. The leftist insinuation that Jews are globalist is itself offensive.

According to its site, AIM explicitly "rejects political violence, extremism and supremacism in all of its forms." Southern Poverty Law Center cynically dismisses AIM as the rebranding of hate, instead of counting any potential victory for tolerance.

Memers in the Middle

Outside the Alt Right Proper is a large contingent of prolific memers and trolls who generally do not self-identify as Alt Right. The moniker is often foisted upon them nonetheless, and their memes are routinely appropriated by those who do identify as Alt Right, so it is difficult for observers to tell the difference. In reality, these memers seek to lampoon the identity politics of the left and of white identitarians, both of which they see as racial collectivism, or to put it more bluntly, racism.

The satirical religion of Kek, adopted by and now attributed to the Alt Right, was actually developed out of an inside joke from gamers and YouTubers. The joke began because LOL showed up as KEK through a Korean translation mechanism designed to prevent opposing teams from viewing each others' communications. When British YouTuber Sargon of Akkad looked at the UK census category of ethnicity as being “self-defined” and with “no objective criteria,” he got the idea to list his ethnicity as Kekistani. The UK had already registered Jedi as a religion based on census returns, so Sargon thought it would be easier to get the Church of Kek registered than
the Kekistani ethnicity.

These memers, gamers and Youtubers already thought it was hilarious that the Pepe frog was declared a hate symbol (along with the okay sign and milk), so when they discovered Kek was the name of an actual Egyptian god of chaos and destruction sometimes depicted as a frog, they were delighted. A flag was created, and immediately declared to be a crypto-Nazi symbol. Soon, an entire mythological narrative was developed, complete with the Memer's Creed, which reads in part,

"I believe in Kek, the Frog God Almighty, maker of the Chan and the lesser-sites [4-chan, 8-chan and other message boards], of all things memed and unmemed. I believe in one Lord Pepe, the Only Messenger of Kek... For us men and for our memes he came down from heaven, and by Shadilay [a catchy disco song by the artist P.E.P.E.] was created by the virgin Matt Furie [cartoonist that originally created Pepe] and became our meme. For our sake he was crucified under Normie oppression, he suffered Nazi association and was buried by Matt Furie, and rose again on the Chan by the power of the Kekistanis...."

--The Memer's Creed of the Church of Kek

Not surprisingly, as the Memer's Creed points out, the Kekistanis' faux victimhood revolves around a great deal of misunderstanding from "normies" of the actual dominant culture who typically don't get their jokes and ideas, try to suppress their voices through mechanisms like deplatforming and shadow banning, and slander them as being part of a Nazi movement.

It is absolutely no wonder observers are confused about the nature of the Alt Right. The term is useless in defining any ideology and should be abandoned in favor of more precise position statements.

X. Online Trolls & the Nazi Threat

If cyberspace were an accurate picture of America, Nazis would be lurking around every corner. But how many hateful online posts and comments reflect genuinely held opinions? Are they the work of trolls in it for shock value, "lulz," or some other obscure mission; accelerationists trying to foment a civil war; sock puppets trying to amplify their message; or false flag actors trying to smear target sites, platforms and their affiliated people?

These bad-faith actors may be all of the above, but their identities and intentions remain a mystery to site owners and users alike, and their online activities pose a major impediment to those who seek to study, understand and combat extremism.

"It is possible...that some users adopt Nazi identity markers as an advanced form of trolling or online harassment," noted J.M. Berger in his September 2016 report, "Nazis vs. ISIS on Twitter," for George Washington University's Program on Extremism. He recognized users may not actually ascribe to the opinions they post, but that there may be "an increase in non-ideological trolling with a white nationalist or Nazi themes."

What's more, that trolling may be coordinated. A 600 percent increase in Nazi accounts from 2012-2016, he concluded, was driven "to some extent, [by] the rise of organized trolling communities seeking to flood social media platforms with negative content, regardless of participants’ actual beliefs." In his conclusion, Berger reiterated:

"To some extent, the rise of an anti-social 'trolling culture' is amplifying the presence of white nationalist content on social media. There is a growing overlap between people engaged with white nationalism and online forums (including 4chan and 8chan) where mostly anonymous participants seek to outdo each other with obnoxious or harassing content. It is unclear in many cases whether these users are committed white nationalists, committed trolls, or something in between."

-- J.M. Berger, George Washington University
Indeed, there is a prolific core of 4chan and 8chan users and gamers that are dedicated to what they call "Nazi trolling" that targets both Nazis and their opponents. By posting as over-the-top extreme racists these users troll Nazis, mocking them and making them appear insane. At the same time these users are trolling the Left in the idea that a large number of Americans are actually as over-the-top racist as the trolls appear to be.

As unhelpful as non-ideological trolling might be in examining actual Nazi presence online, the likelihood of such efforts being organized, as Berger suggests, is truly insidious. In fact, some argue that paid operatives using multiple accounts -- sock puppets -- are behind much of the most offensive content, in an organized campaign to smear political enemies.

Stanford postdoctoral researcher Srijan Kumar works with artificial intelligence to "understand, detect, mitigate, and predict both malicious users and disinformation on social web platforms." In a collaborative project with Stanford and the University of Maryland, researchers looked at nine sites that use Disqus for commenting, including CNN, NPR, Breitbart and Fox News, and found keys to identifying sock puppets by studying accounts that posted from the same IP address, in order to learn how to recognize such activity when IP information is masked or not available.

According to New Scientist magazine writer, Edd Gant, "[the researchers] found that sock puppets contribute poorer quality content, writing shorter posts that are often downvoted or reported by other users. They post on more controversial topics, spend more time replying to other users and are more abusive." PC Magazine reports that Kumar is now working on a $1.2 million DARPA-funded project called, "Active Social Engineering Defense" to study "how malicious actors carry out social engineering attacks on unsuspecting victims."

In 2014, Glenn Greenwald reported that Western intelligence agencies were attempting to manipulate online discourse with "extreme tactics of deception," based on information disclosed from the Edward Snowden archive. Greenwald alleged that intelligence agencies "are attempting to control, infiltrate, manipulate, and warp online discourse....To see how extremist these programs are, just consider the tactics they boast of using to achieve those ends: 'false flag operations' (posting material to the internet and falsely attributing it to someone else), fake victim blog posts (pretending to be a victim of the individual whose reputation they want to destroy), and posting 'negative information' on various forums."

Trolls tend to have seemingly unlimited time to engage in their offensive activity -- almost like they were doing it as a full time job. Of course the suggestion that paid leftist operatives might be posing as neo-Nazis to discredit the Right (and distance Democrats from their KKK-past) would seem to be the very type of wild conspiracy theory that could get someone labeled an extremist. But if the belief in an unproven conspiracy alone is indicative of extremism, then the entire mainstream media fits the definition based on their unshakable commitment to the Trump-Russia collusion theory. So it's worth looking at the leftist troll theory, if only because so many on the right believe in it.

"We must ask ourselves, how much of the supposed hate speech that we see on the Internet today, is really just artificial?" said Infowars reporter Millie Weaver in a video released after the Christchurch shooting, as Infowars and other platforms were coming under fire for the racist posts bombarding their sites in the comments below their content. Weaver announced that an undercover operative had successfully infiltrated a "leftist troll farm," that was organized through Discord and had the goal of "sowing division online in an effort called "accelerationist."" The infiltrator, whose identity was concealed in the video, alleged, "Their belief, currently, is that the United States is going to collapse, and that we should do everything possible to do it as quickly as possible."

In 2016, the multi-million dollar Clinton Super PAC, Correct the Record, was accused of using paid operatives to run multiple sock-puppet accounts to challenge Hillary detractors and pose as grassroots supporters in its Breaking Barriers Project. "It is
meant to appear to be coming organically from people and their social media networks in a groundswell of activism, when in fact it is highly paid and highly tactical," Craft Media/Digital's chief executive Brian Donahue told the LA Times.

Similarly, the New York Daily News described it as "an online mob of paid trolls designed to attack any and every person who says one cross word about Hillary Clinton on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Reddit, or elsewhere." What might these committed and trained operatives be doing with their time, post-election?

Could some part of the widespread white supremacist and neo-Nazi rhetoric visible online be a false flag operation perpetrated by individual enthusiasts or by organizations, either to smear political opponents, or to draw more attention to what they believe to be a real problem? The hate hoax phenomenon suggests it's at least possible -- even probable.

XI. Question Everything: Hate Hoaxes and Extreme Astroturfing

Across America people have begun taking a closer look at hate crime hoaxes after the disproven Covington Catholic "lynchmob" and the disproven Jussie Smollet hate crime. A less-organic style of hoax has also been blooming in America, with little scrutiny: the paid protest racket. How far would social justice warriors go to convince the public of a hate crisis in America?

The site FakeHateMap.com tracks debunked hate crimes back to 1960. It shows about 600 documented cases in almost 60 years, with almost a third of those in the last three years, and at least 30 in the month of November 2016 alone. Occasionally, hoaxes were actual mistakes such as a Trump election celebration that was reported as a brazen Klan rally because the journalist imagined robes and hate flags in her own grainy photo.

Perhaps a dozen of the "hoaxes" blamed on hateful white people over the last three years were in fact legitimate hate crimes perpetrated by individuals who don't fit the stereotype, such as the vandalism of a synagogue perpetrated by a gay black former Democratic anti-hate crime intern who reportedly resented New York liberals and was anti-Israel. In another dozen, hate allegations were used to cover up actual crimes that were non-bias related. The vast majority of hoaxes, however, were fabricated events designed to draw attention to a perceived problem.

Each event succeeded in gaining significant media exposure -- enough to get it captured by the Fake Hate Map -- often going viral and disrupting entire campuses and cities, while the hoax discovery was often less well-publicized.

Some individual events listed on the Fake Hate Map actually represented hundreds of fake hate incidents, such as the 19 year-old Israeli-American student who was charged with making at least 245 threatening calls to Jewish Community Centers and other Jewish organizations, involving bomb and active shooter threats.

Many of hoaxes were designed to specifically implicate Trump supporters. For example, in March 2016 a fake mosque arson story was picked up by multiple news outlets. The entirely fabricated story claimed three Muslims were critically injured in a mosque fire in Bristol, Kansas, a city that does not exist. In the report, a fictitious Trump supporter was immediately blamed for setting the fire. And in November 2016, a man admitted he lied about a threatened lynching by men claiming it's "Trump Country now," because he wanted to "raise awareness about things that are going on around the country."

College students were particularly active with hoaxes, often sending hate notes to themselves and sometimes canvassing their school with flyers, such as the Muslim internment announcements posted around UCSD's campus to spark outrage. It was the Gustavus Adolphus College's Diversity Leadership Council that put up flyers saying,
"America is a white nation," and calling on people to turn in illegal aliens.

A great many hoaxes went beyond threatening messages, vandalism and phantom assailants, however. Some went so far as to set their own cars, houses and mosques on fire. In 2017, for example, transgender activist Nikki Joly is alleged to have burnt down his own home with pets inside to galvanize interest in gay rights. The same year, a woman was arrested for starting a fire at her own mosque "to make a statement," police believe.

For every hoax that is outed, many more are likely never discovered, leaving a broad question mark over the many unsolved hate incidents reported in America today.

**Coordinated Hoaxes**

Though most hoaxes are perpetrated by individual actors, at least some have been orchestrated by groups of activists, as in the Gustavus Adolphus case. During the 2016 election campaign, Project Veritas revealed efforts by Democratic PAC operatives who purposely tried to start fights at Trump rallies to sow anarchy and make the MAGA crowd look violent, a tactic they called “bird-dogging.”

How far would political activists go to smear opponents?

The ethically-challenged company **Crowds on Demand** calls itself "the ultimate guerilla lobbying and government relations firm," manufacturing support or opposition for its clients' causes to manipulate public opinion and lawmakers through a mirage of grassroots activism, i.e. astroturfing.

The company boasts that it has worked for a foreign government to give the appearance of public support for a foreign dignitary at a United Nations meeting, and tanked the reputation of a client's competitor, allowing the target company to be purchased by said client for 5 percent of its original value. It's less forthright about being hired to disrupt a New Orleans vote on a new power plant -- or sued for extortion after prolonged harassment of a Dartmouth adjunct.

Crowds on Demand has raised more than a few eyebrows for a penchant for deception that seems to know no bounds, save this one: it will not work for "hate groups," founder Adam Swart has repeatedly said. But would it work against them?

What was originally billed as a faux paparazzi and brand enthusiasm outfit has morphed into an outright political machine in recent years. Journalist Davy Rothbart reports, the company bills around $600 for paparazzi, $3,000 for a P.R. stunt, $10,000 for a weeklong political demonstration, and $25,000-50,000 for a prolonged campaign of protests. [A]ccording to Adam [Swart], protests have become the company’s growth sector."

Perhaps outfits like Crowds on Demand do have their limits. Maybe such groups wouldn't actually hire an actor to do a Nazi salute at a pro-Trump event (like this Antifa protester did at a free speech rally), or change the Charlottesville torchbearers' chants of "He will not divide us," and "You will not replace us," to something more offensive, or direct traffic for them to surround counter-protesters stationed around the Robert E. Lee statue when they were hesitant to advance. *Maybe that would be too far* for the zealots that worked for Clinton's bird-dogging PAC, or the army of social justice activists financed by George Soros.

Maybe. But given that actual neo-Nazi rallies tend to be cancelled or only draw a couple dozen people in a country of 350 million, hoaxers have their work cut out for them to convince Americans of the dire Nazi threat. As the hate hoax and political actor phenomena both grow, it might be naive to think the two wouldn't merge.

**XII. Word Games and Dog Whistles in the Hunt for Hate**

Policy positions are a matter of deep
disagreement, so it is unsurprising that hateful motives are regularly ascribed to them. But this movement to jump to the worst assumptions about the intentions of political opponents is not good for the country. Reasonable people should be able to debate and disagree on the policies themselves without summarily discounting their proponents as bigoted.

Labeling political adversaries as extremist bigots is an effective strategy precisely because most Americans oppose bigotry, and those who employ this strategy know it. Playing the hate card and spotlighting extremists has become something of an art form; it relies on clever word games and presumptive "dog whistles" to silence legitimate policy positions.

**Destroying Language to Destroy Ideas**

The "white nationalist" charge is used deceptively to blur the lines between different groups to create guilt by association. "America First" and national sovereignty proponents are nationalists who may or may not happen to be white, but when skin color is added to describe their ideological orientation it serves to lump nationalists together with ethnonationalists -- an exceedingly small contingent who support a white ethnostate for European descendants. An even smaller number of these people might actually advocate roundups and other totalitarian means to achieve a white separatist paradigm.

America First may describe a position on trade, immigration or foreign policy that has nothing to do with race, or it may describe an opposition to global governance. But because the allegedly anti-Semitic "America First Committee" opposed intervention in World War II eighty years ago -- until Pearl Harbor -- Americans are no longer to even use the term, by some accounts.

Similarly, the words globalist or anti-globalist are now considered *verboten*, based on the theory that it is actually a dog-whistle for anti-Semitism. Never mind that Antifa's precursor, the Black Bloc, rioted against globalization at the 1999 World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle, with nary a whisper of anti-Semitic accusations. Don Lemon now argues of the term "globalist," regardless of intent: "that is not the term that you [should] use."

University of Toronto psychology professor, Dr. Jordan Peterson, warns that the destruction of language is a precursor to authoritarianism. "I've studied authoritarianism for a very long time - for 40 years - and they're started by people's attempts to control the ideological and linguistic territory," he told the BBC. Of course, the strategy makes it very difficult for one to promote policies that favor the interests of the American people, and simultaneously brands a huge swath of the country as bigoted for harboring such desires.

**Anti-Globalist is not anti-Semitic**

The outrageous suggestion of those who'd disallow the use of the terms "America First" or "globalist" is that people who think Americans should be free to shape their own laws actually believe in a conspiracy that Jewish people are trying to control the world. While some people are expressing opposition to a New World Order of a technocratic, borderless global control apparatus, or behind-the-scenes decision making by the world's wealthiest and most powerful one percent at the annual Bilderberg conference, a growing number of people on the Left hear only anti-Semitic messages.

Between these two positions are many Americans who simply do not want the country to be hamstrung by things like the Paris Accords or some worldwide version of the European Union pact that other countries are struggling to escape. Those who have watched the Yellow Vest protests in Paris or the Brexit movement in England may legitimately not want to sacrifice their own national sovereignty. That position has no relation to anti-Semitism.

**Nationalism as a Unifying Force**

Far from bigoted, President Trump speaks of nationalism as a unifying force. This is the vision
he laid out in his inaugural address, while his adversaries were too busy screaming, crying or rioting to hear:

“When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights and heal our divisions. It’s time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots."

-- Donald J. Trump

To deride those sentiments as Hitlarian is to cheapen that horrible history and willfully disregard the president's actual statements.

Pride in a country that cherishes individual freedom, rights -- and sovereignty -- is a fundamentally different matter than pride in a country that chose totalitarianism and sought to spread it through conquest.

Celebrating Western Civilization
Another widely misunderstood position is that of the Western Chauvinist, ascribed to by the fraternal drinking club, Proud Boys, and others. To many ears, the term sounds terrible. But the Proud Boys, whose membership is diverse, eschew political correctness and express pride in what they see as Western Civilization, characterized by the exact features that allow for freedom and equality under the law for all people.

In the OfficialProudBoys.com website, Lloyd Somerset explains the term chauvinist was not applied to any male bias prior to the 1960s, and that it originally spoke to strong patriotism. He writes:

"A Western Chauvinist is a proponent of Western Civilization, someone who supports a secular government whose legal code is informed by Judeo-Christian ethics and whose origins lie in the Greco-Roman tradition of the Republic... When we Proud Boys say, 'I am a proud Western Chauvinist,' we are saying 'I am a proud and unabashed proponent of Western Civilization.'

That is it. It has nothing to do with race, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, or even national origin."

-- Lloyd Somerset, Proud Boy

Ibn Warraq, author of "Why the West is Best: A Muslim Apostate's Defense of Liberal Democracy," offers another look at why those opposed to extremist bigotry might adore Western Civilization:

"The great ideas of the West—rationalism, self-criticism, the disinterested search for truth, the separation of church and state, the rule of law and equality under the law, freedom of thought and expression, human rights, and liberal democracy—are superior to any others devised by humankind. It was the West that took steps to abolish slavery...."

-- Ibn Warraq, "Why the West is Best"

Warraq further gives a nod to Western Civilization's Judeo Christian roots, which "added a sense of conscience and charity, tempering justice with forgiveness."

Words are a critical function of thought, and speech is a vital alternative to violence. As words, and the positions they describe, are redefined and branded as hate speech, cognitive categories slowly erode and to some minds, the promotion of freedom itself is fast becoming an extremist position.

XIII. SPLC's Slanderous, Scandalous Hate-Maker Hypocrisy
Southern Poverty Law Center's infamous hate map is well-worth some time for review, but not for the reasons the organization claims. What passes for hate groups by the list-meisters is truly astounding, the shock of which is only surpassed by SPLC's own sordid story of scandal as the multi-million dollar nonprofit continues its dramatic fall from grace.

SPLC lists just over a thousand current hate groups in America, hundreds of which represent
individual chapters of discreet groups. The Center has neatly divided hate into 14 categories, one of which is "general hate." The largest single category, at 264, is black nationalist, which SPLC considers to be a growing movement. The KKK and neo-Nazi chapters together total 163, and are said to be on the decline.

Placed on equal footing with such groups are a wide range of organizations who often fail to see their own hate, but do tend to cross the tax-exempt Center's political aims. Some of these less-obvious haters are quite impressive, like the supposedly "male supremacist," A Voice for Men, whose membership "crosses all lines of sex, race, sexuality, religion, lack of religion and political orientation," but opposes sexism. If you can find any evidence of what might inspire violent extremism on their site, they invite you to contact them to show them where, because the site says, "We have scoured everything and can't find it." Nonetheless they endure death threats and protests from the "anti-hate" crusaders.

The other allegedly male supremacist group, Return of Kings, was created by Daryush Valizadeh, author of "Game: How to Meet, Attract and Date Attractive Women." The site promises some entertaining and humorous reading in the course of promoting "healthy masculinity."

Almost half of the 100 supposedly anti-Muslim groups listed are chapters of Act for America, founded by Brigitte Gabriel, who has addressed the Pentagon, the Joint Forces Staff College, the US Special Operations Command, the FBI, and many others. Meanwhile the FBI stopped listing SPLC as a "trusted source" in 2014.

Perhaps less well known in the allegedly anti-Muslim category is the Truth in Love Project founded by Shahram Hadian, who immigrated from Iran in 1999 and converted to Christianity. Fundamentalist Islam would have him killed for the crime of apostasy, but American hospitality has simply hate-listed his organization.

Almost half of the "general hate" groups are chapters of either the Proud Boys fraternal drinking club, which explicitly bars those who identify as Alt-Right, white nationalist or white supremacist from membership, or the American Guard, which is inclusive of both sexes and all races. The latter was so offended by its listing that it went on the offensive to draw attention to divorce documents published in July 2018, that detailed allegations of SPLC founder Morris Dees' attempted child molestation of his teenage stepdaughter in the 1970s.

Scandal, Hypocrisy and Lawsuits
SPLC fired Dees less than a month later, with two dozen employees signing a letter with "allegations of mistreatment, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, and racism." The following week, director Richard Cohen and legal director Rhonda Brownstein both resigned.

SPLC's rapid implosion really got rolling in June 2018, when a $3.375 million settlement and apology was agreed to in Maajid Nawaz's lawsuit against the Center for labeling Nawaz, a practicing Muslim, as an anti-Muslim extremist. Immediately following the settlement multiple organizations reportedly began considering similar lawsuits for slanderous hate group designation.

One suit was brought in December of 2018, and two additional suits were brought against SPLC this year. The first, brought by Baltimore lawyer Glen Allen over his former ties to the group National Alliance, alleges SPLC illegally obtaining documents. Allen's lawsuit, which charges racketeering, wire fraud and defamation, specifically demands a judgement on SPLC's controversial tax-exempt status, and the Center has hired outside counsel to defend the case.

Next came a suit from the Center for Immigration Studies. In its press release, CIS summed up what is likely a common sentiment for many Americans: "CIS regularly opposes higher levels of immigration for sound public policy reasons,
not because of any animus toward immigrants as human beings." In fact, the CIS tagline is "Lower-immigration, Pro-immigrant."

A third suit was brought by Proud Boys founder Gavin McInnes. According to the f, "the complaint accuses the tax-exempt left-wing group of using the 'hate' label in a deliberate campaign to 'destroy' its chosen ideological enemies. It seems the SPLC considers more or less anyone who supports President Trump to be a 'far-right' extremist."

**Hate Charge Begets Hateful Response**

The hate group designation is particularly significant to the topic of extremism for two reasons. First, false hate designations are harmful because they give the impression that America has a much larger bigoted population than what may actually exist. This alarmism unjustly marginalizes innocent people who have every right to be heard, while obscuring the actual threats of violent supremacists by "crying wolf" too many times. Second, false hate designations contribute to left wing extremist attacks against the organizations listed as hate groups and the people associated with them.

SPLC-inspired extremist violence was evident in 2012, when Floyd Lee Corkins shot a security guard at the Family Research Council in an attempt to kill as many FRC employees as possible. Corkins later confessed that he learned of the organization and found its location from the SPLC hate group map. FRC -- whose vision is "a prevailing culture in which all human life is valued, families flourish, and religious liberty thrives," -- is still listed on the hate map.

Hodgkinson's targeting of Scalise and other Republicans at a baseball practice in 2017 could also be inspired by SPLC as it was discovered that the shooter had previously "liked" SPLC's site. Southern Poverty had put out a Hate Watch two and half years earlier on Scalise.

Multiple violent attacks on the Proud Boys are very likely inspired by SPLC's characterization of it as a violent, extremist, "white nationalist" hate group, a charge that has been repeated without question by media outlets across the country. In one attempted attack on Proud Boys last year, Antifa members were arrested after targeting two Marines, who they mistakenly believed to be Proud Boys members, all the while hurling ethnic slurs at the Hispanic soldiers in their twisted passion to stamp out Nazi white supremacists.

Trump supporters more generally are in a similar situation to all those listed among SPLC's hate groups. The media has marked them as bigots and for that reason they are under siege today as much as any other marginalized group.

**XIV. “Anti-Racist” Education Fuels all Types of Extremism**

Perceived or real discrimination is a prime factor in the radicalization of people of all stripes toward extremism. Modern "anti-racist" education has promoted group identity and anti-white bias, with disastrous outcomes for the country.

Just after the Charlottesville rally, Huffington Post published, "This is How White Supremacists Get Radicalized," by Anna Almendrala. In it, violent extremist researcher Alejandro Beutel described a variety of non-ideological factors in radicalization related to intelligence, childhood trauma, mental illness and substance abuse. In terms of ideological factors, he pointed first and foremost to the fear of white genocide.

Almendrala explained that Beutel's research showed "groups mostly focus on the theme of 'white genocide' — the notion that other races and ethnic groups are overtaking whites in the U.S. — for recruitment."

"While the term 'white supremacy' indicates that people in the movement feel superior to other races, Beutel's own research shows that fear of losing one's place in society rather than a feeling of dominance is what draws people to these movements....The notion that the white race is
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diminishing is the most effective gateway argument to the movement because it’s grounded in a fact: The U.S. is set to become a minority-majority country between 2044 and 2055."

-- Anna Almendrala, "This is How White Supremacists Get Radicalized," Huffington Post

As Beutel indicates, white genocide is more focused on the defense of white people based on a feeling of being under threat than it is a desire for dominance. The term is often traced to the 1995 White Genocide Manifesto written by David Lane while he was serving a 190 year prison sentence for his participation in numerous crimes as a member of the white supremacist group The Order. Lane spoke of an existential Zionist threat to the "white race."

To most Americans, Lane's manifesto seems outlandish and appalling, but the ideas in it may be gaining new life, ironically, due to the "anti-racist" education systems employed in colleges, universities and high schools today.

Racism Redefined and Privilege Theory

Two books ushered in the sanctioning of anti-white racism back in the 1970s, the Medium's Alexander Zubatov explained. First, Pat Bidell's 1970 book, "New Perspectives on Race," gave the dangerous new definition that racism equals privilege plus power. That is, people of color would presumably never have power and on that basis could never be racist against white people.

Judith H. Katz then popularized this falsehood in her influential 1978 book, "White Awareness: Handbook for Anti-Racism Training," which became the foundation for anti-racism education. Katz sought to differentiate the definition of racism from prejudice. She wrote,

"It is important to push for the understanding that...Third World people cannot be racist against Whites in the United States. Third World people can be prejudiced against Whites, but clearly they do not have the power to enforce that prejudice."

-- Judith H. Katz, "White Awareness: Handbook for Anti-Racism Training"

Out of this new definition of racism as prejudice plus power, came the modern privilege theory that is now taught in schools of education instead of the old "colorblind model." Privilege theory has utterly backfired in the effort to combat racism, argued the Federalist's David Marcus in May 2016. Marcus pointed to a 2013 research article questioning Peggy McIntosh's privilege theory in Harvard Education Review, subtitled, "How Teacher Education's Focus on White Privilege Undermines Antiracism."

The Harvard article concluded that "McIntosh's conception of white privilege has been at the center of anti-racist thought and action in teacher education. We argue, however, that McIntosh’s ideas simplify white racial identity in dangerous ways. We also demonstrate that white privilege pedagogy demands confession, but that confession is a dead end." Not surprisingly, "They found that many disadvantaged white students reject the notion of their grand privileges and resented the key confessional component of white privilege education," Marcus explained.

The confessional component is the mechanism by which white students are made to admit they have been racist without knowing it. Functionally, privilege theory means all white people are born with the original sin of racism and they can never escape it. The hypocrisy of inherent prejudice within "racially conscious" education directly contributes to the rise in white identitarians who are forced to see themselves through the lens of race without the attendant pride that every other group is granted. White supremacists then react to the intense criticism of white people by focusing on perceived flaws in other groups.

Marcus challenged:

"One can teach against white supremacy by encouraging students to treat everyone as equal,
or at least as individuals not defined in important ways by their race. Privilege theory does not allow for this approach. It demands that differences be front and center and that we always consider a person’s race in considering him. This focus on 'valuing differences' over 'the colorblind model' unlocked the door to the white supremacist revival that today’s anti-white rhetoric has kicked open.”

-- David Marcus, "How Anti-White Rhetoric Is Fueling White Nationalism," The Federalist

Making matters worse, the recognition of anti-white bias itself is now treated as a gateway to white supremacy. In 2014, Campus Reform reported that Iowa University was investigating a series of "deeply offensive" flyers that appeared around campus asking, "Are you sick of anti-white propaganda in college?" Another set of fliers showed two white people with the shocking caption, "We have a right to exist." Far from eliciting any introspection, the mere mention of anti-white bias was treated as a hate crime and students were told to go to campus police with any information about the fliers.

Despite many good intentions, the modern "anti-racist" education paradigm has created a perfect storm of sanctioned bigotry, required focus on group identity, hypocrisy and resentment. The white genocide theory propagated a quarter of a century ago may well gain traction today, not for the selfish desire to retain population numbers and dominate, but as a self-defense instinct against what appears to many to be the growing demonization, dehumanization and hatred of white people. It is unlikely that extremism of any variety can be effectively addressed without changing this educational component.

XV. Data Keep Showing Anti-White Bias is Real

In recent years researchers have struggled to understand the results of polls that show white people feel discriminated against. The source of anti-white bias may stem from the suspicion, especially on the part of white liberals, that white people are racist, yet the poll data itself is often interpreted as more evidence of white racism.

Recognition of anti-white bias is often dismissed as resentment among white people that other racial groups are doing better in America. In a 2011 Association for Psychological Science journal article entitled, "Whites See Racism as a Zero-Sum Game That They Are Now Losing," the authors approached their research with a theory that was not proven, but presented it as if it were nonetheless. They wrote, "We expected Whites to view racism as a zero-sum game, such that decreases in perceived anti-Black racism over the past six decades would be associated with increases in perceived anti-White racism."

Because white people reported more anti-white bias developing at the same time that they reported anti-black bias was declining, the authors' confirmed their expectation that white people see race relations as a zero sum game in which a better environment for black people necessitates a worse position for white people due to the loss of dominance in society. "Of course, our results are correlational in nature, and as such, they do not necessarily reveal that Whites believe that decreases in anti-Black bias cause increases in anti-White bias," they allowed however. But the authors could not fathom that anti-white bias simply reflected a growing dislike of white people in society, regardless of how any other racial group was doing.

In a 2017 poll jointly issued from NPR, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, 55 percent of white respondents said they felt discriminated against, but the study's publishers stressed that those respondents could not articulate how they were discriminated against, thus prompting ridicule in news reports and on The View, of those who recognized anti-white discrimination.
Poll respondent Tim Musick commented, "I think that pretty much, because you're white, you're automatically thrown into that group as being a bigot and a racist and that somehow you perceive yourself as being more superior to everybody else, which is ridiculous." Therein may lie the key to understanding anti-white bias.

At its core, anti-white racism stems from the assumption that white people are bigoted oppressors and its primary outcome ranges from automatic disrespect to absolute hatred. As such, it may not register by the same metrics as other forms of discrimination, such as the ability to get a bank loan or hold public office, and it may not be as easily articulated, and may not be felt equally across income levels.

GenForward polling of millennials in 2017 also showed that forty-eight percent of young white respondents said discrimination of white people had become as big a problem as discrimination against blacks and other minorities. While an overwhelming majority of all ethnic minorities felt they faced similar problems and could be political allies, only about half of each minority group felt that people of color and whites faced similar problems and could be political allies, compared to 84 percent of white people who felt that way.

More recently, an April 2019 Pew Research study showed that 45 percent of white respondents said people assumed they were racist or prejudiced because of their ethnicity. Yet whites were far less likely than any other group to say race or ethnicity was central to their identity, with only 5 percent saying it was extremely important and 10 percent saying it was very important.

Dictionary.com ironically codified the dismissal of anti-white bias this month by adding the term "white fragility" to its site, defined as, "The tendency among members of the dominant white cultural group to have a defensive, wounded, angry, or dismissive response to evidence of racism." The white professor who invented the term, however, defined white fragility as "a state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable, triggering a range of defensive moves.” Needless to say the suggestion of fragility in any other ethnic group would be abhorrent.

Also just added to the online dictionary was "white lash," defined as, "a hostile or violent reaction by white people to the advances or influx of other racial or ethnic groups." Together the two new definitions illustrate how racism is assumed for white people. In "white fragility," supposedly "dominant" white people are alleged to have a "tendency" to either be overly defensive of anti-white bias, or dismiss evidence of racism (which is presumed to exist only against minorities, anti-white bias therefore being non-existent or worthy of dismissal). In "white lash," the policy positions that white people may take are assumed to be racially motivated.

Out-Group Bias of White Liberals

Significantly, American Greatness reported that two separate research polls show at least some of the anti-white bias comes from white liberals. A GenForward poll of millennials, and an American National Election Studies dataset of adults of all ages, both show that favorable in-group bias is common across ethnicities. However, white people across the spectrum have lower in-group bias than other ethnicities, while only white liberals show a favorable out-group bias, that is, a preference for ethnic minorities over whites.

American Greatness pointed out that white liberals are far more likely than any other demographic to hold positions of power in academia and entertainment. Combined with other advances achieved by ethnic minorities, the positions of power held by white liberals who may actually prefer minorities to other whites, could mean that people of color "have power" in America today.

A new Journal of Experimental Psychology study indicates that teaching about white privilege
results in liberals being less sympathetic to poor white people. When presented with identical stories of poverty for a white person or a black person, those liberals who were educated in white privilege did not show any expected increased sympathy for poor black people compared to those who were not educated in white privilege. However, white privilege instruction had the effect of reducing liberals' sympathy for poor white people, the study found. The abstract explains, "Moreover, these shifts in sympathy were associated with greater punishment/blame and fewer external attributions for a poor White person’s plight. We conclude that, among social liberals, White privilege lessons may increase beliefs that poor White people have failed to take advantage of their racial privilege—leading to negative social evaluations."

Meanwhile, anti-white bias among black people remains a persistent problem according to African-American pastor Rev. Jesse Lee Peterson, and one that is directly tied to the victimhood narrative promoted in privilege theory. Rev. Peterson chided, "Since the ’60s, whites have been blamed for all the ills afflicting black Americans...Whites are still blamed for slavery and are constantly accused of benefiting from 'white privilege' at the expense of minorities." He argued that broader anti-Trump sentiment is "not so much about Donald Trump. It’s about stopping 'Whitey' and destroying America," but he pointed out that hatred of conservative white Republicans misses the mark because slavery, segregation, and the Ku Klux Klan were exclusively part of the Democratic Party.

"For the last 26 years, I’ve called on blacks to get over anger and blame. Most blacks hate whites, and now they’ve become like the 'racists' they hate. These days, people are encouraged to be angry and to blame others," Peterson said. "Whites know they’re hated and scapegoated solely based on their race, and some feel hopeless."

Peterson pointed with concern to statistics on rising mortality, substances abuse, depression and suicide rates among white people. On the other hand, as the Medium's Alexander Zubatov highlighted, these same findings -- and indeed new stories of anything bad that happens to white people -- are typically met with "glee, scorn and ridicule" elsewhere. Zubatov pointed to Salon.com's article, "White People Can't Hang: Black Americans may be more resilient to stress than white Americans."

Salon assessed that disproportionately poor health consequences for white people under stress indicates that white people have less experience with adversity while "[black people] have mastered their coping skills." Zubatov countered, "I have a different explanation: being subjected to stressful life events is one thing, but being subjected to stressful life events and being ridiculed and demonized for it rather than being empathized with as a result is another thing entirely."

In 2019, a new and severe stress has been placed on white Americans generally, and conservative whites specifically: the unfounded allegation that they represent the dominant extremist terror threat in the country. In May, CNN reported that the Anti-Defamation League and others are lobbying Congress for a new domestic terror law to identify and combat white supremacists and "white nationalists." They want lawmakers and Americans to "name white men as potentially dangerous," and start talking about "white terror."

Far from fragile, white people are uniquely expected to take the privilege of this collective guilt in stride.

**XVI. Censoring Extremists Does Not Quiet “White Genocide” Fears**

Most people who recognize anti-white bias do not become white supremacists who believe in a Zionist conspiracy to enact white genocide. Even
fewer go on to commit mass shootings. At least some may, however, and on their path toward extremism they are expressly not listened to, but censored and mocked instead. This approach is more likely to exacerbate the situation than defuse it.

After Trump's election, the Canadian Broadcasting Network released a comedy sketch titled, "A wake-up call for the alt right: A beige horizon is inevitable." It heralds the day when white people are lost through racial mixing and diversity is a relic of the past. A month later, former Drexel University Professor George Ciccariello-Maher tweeted, "All I want for Christmas is white genocide." Both claimed to be mocking white supremacy, but the messages only became marketing tools for the movement.

Before the year was up, San Diego State University Professor Roberto Hernandez doubled down, but sought to clarify, the edgy tweet with his missive, "White Genocide from Baldwin to Ciccariello-Maher." Hernandez began,

"White genocide would not only be good, it is necessary and even unavoidable; that is, if we are interested in the survival of the planet, humanity, and all life forms – though to be clear the phrase 'white genocide' is a bit of a misnomer. Perhaps most accurate would be the concept of collective mass 'white' ontological suicide or more simply put: the end of white supremacy."

-- SDSU Professor Roberto Hernandez

However, Dr. Hernandez quickly stressed, "'white genocide' has little to do with violence or the physical death of actual living 'white' people." Rather, it describes their voluntary "collective disinvestment...from all forms of racial thinking and their own holding on to the benefits accrued directly and indirectly through a persistent global structure of white supremacy over the last 500 years."

Hernandez pointed out that the "white race" is a biological fiction, and employed the language of poet James Baldwin, who described "people who think they're white" as a politically-chosen, oppressively-oriented identity in early American history. "For there to be white genocide, there must be an actual white people," Hernandez surmised.

On the other side of this debate, Robert Whitaker's website, FightWhiteGenocide.com seems to agree that white genocide is not about overt violence and killing of white people (at least for now):

"This genocide is being carried out by means of mass non-white immigration and forced assimilation in ALL and ONLY white countries the goal of which is to force blend ONLY white people out of existence. Anyone who objects to this crime is subject to harassment, intimidation, violent acts and threats of violence, psychological terrorism, job loss, and prison terms."

-- Robert Whitaker, 2020 Stop White Genocide Presidential Candidate

Whereas many dismisses this as merely a demographic change, Whitaker's group argues that it still violates the international law against genocide, specifically, UN Resolution 260, Article II, Section C, which defines genocide to include: "Deliberately inflicting on the [national, ethnic, racial or religious] group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;" and Article III, Section D, which identifies as punishable, "Direct and public incitement to commit genocide."

Whitaker's group says they're against white supremacy in all its forms, though they do identify as "pro-white" and Whitaker admits to having "an attitude" toward Jews, as he argues Jews have an attitude toward non-Jews. The group advocates for the freedom to speak about what they see as a problem, and says, "We unequivocally condemn, denounce and disavow the use of violence to achieve political
ends [emphasis in original]."

Just as Hernandez argues there can be no white genocide because there is no white race, Whitaker counters that if there is no white race then how can there be white privilege or a history of oppression at the hands of white people? Those who are unconcerned by, or even promoting, their version of white genocide have plenty of complaints to voice against the people they view to be white, while withholding any mention of their positive achievements, such as leading the movement to end slavery worldwide.

Is it actually possible to opt out of a white identity? When a fellow classmate discounts a student's perspective saying, "You're a white male!" can a person simply say, "No, I'm not," and move on to be heard without the baggage of all those people falsely associated with him throughout history? The public humiliation of Rachel Dolezal for passing herself as "black" (another category that does not exist) might argue against the possibility of opting-in to the People of Color group, albeit as a lighter shade of color.

Hernandez need not worry about race: he has ethnic identity and teaches students about the Chicano movement in the Chicano / Chicana Studies Department. Would he grant the people formerly known as white the same courtesy of being part of a European heritage movement? Would his calculus on white genocide change if it was termed the genocide of ethnically European peoples, or the collective genocides of the Celtic, Nordic, Anglican, Norman, Germanic, Rus and other peoples?

There are legitimate reasons for classifying individuals on ethnic, if not "racial" grounds, for medical, bureaucratic and research purposes -- not the least of which being, most pertinent to this particular subject matter, the ability to track violent crime statistics. Perhaps some might no longer care to know how many "white" people commit hate crimes, and the Anti-Defamation League could stop asking Congress and the American people to talk about "white terror."

Perhaps also, we might no longer be able to track crimes against people who are targeted because of the light color of their skin.

Concern over current events in South Africa is a common theme expressed by those who reference white genocide. In July 2016, speaking in support of land takings without compensation, far-left Economic Freedom Fighters' Julius Malema famously said, "We are not calling for the slaughter of white people, at least for now...."

Two years later, Malema clarified and reiterated to Turkish Radio and Television Broadcasting Corporation, "I have never called for their killing, at least for now. I can't guarantee the future."

In March, Harper's Magazine attempted to allay any fears in, "Letter from South Africa: The Myth of White Genocide." Journalist James Pogue assured, "there's no direct connection between murders of white farmers and land reform," though he did admit -- obliquely alluding to the horrific Walkerville family murders -- "It's a simple fact that there is an element of racial vitriol to some murders of white farmers."

The extreme case of South Africa seems a far-away threat to most Americans -- and it is -- but if grievances over slavery could be so fervently whipped up 150 years after its demise, who's to say post-racial but fair-skinned people wouldn't some day be brutally targeted in a future America, Europe, Australia or New Zealand, after decades committed to immigration and the destruction of the white racial identity? The censorship and mocking of these concerns do nothing to alleviate them.

XVII. Global Realities of Religious Persecution

Though "white genocide" appears to be an enormous leap from anti-white bias, there are founded concerns over actual attempts at genocide of Christians, and expressed interest in genocide of Jews, worldwide.
The violent treatment of (often non-white) Christians around the world has gained attention after the Easter bombings in Sri Lanka that left more than 350 people dead and 500 wounded. Open Doors USA, a leading watch group on worldwide Christian persecution, reports that 245 million Christians live under high levels of persecution today, and each month on average, 345 Christians are killed for faith-related reasons, 105 churches and Christian buildings are burned or attacked, and 219 Christians are detained without trial, arrested, sentenced and imprisoned.

The 50 countries that are most dangerous for Christians are listed by Open Doors on its World Watch List. Represented on the list are countries with communist regimes like North Korea or China, countries with religious nationalism like India, or countries with extensive organized crime like Mexico, as well as 33 countries with Islamic oppression – a threat that crosses national boundaries.

Gender-specific persecution has recently been studied by Open Doors as an intentional strategy for population reduction. Reporting on the "shocking reality of persecution of women," Open Doors states, "Even in the most restricted circumstances, gender-specific persecution is a key means of destroying the minority Christian community."

Their in-depth report on gender-specific Christian persecution "leaves no doubt that at least one primary objective of Boko Haram and the Islamic State is to eradicate the Christian population by every means." Christian women may be trafficked as sex slaves and targeted with rape, forced into marriage with Muslim men, forced to divorce Christian men, forced into abortion, and denied child custody among other persecutions.

Christians are particularly vulnerable around the world owing to the worldwide distribution of the population. But Jews are no less a target, as reflected in Europe, where there is a "reluctance of European authorities to identify anti-Semitism imported from the Middle East as being as toxic as indigenous ultranationalist anti-Semitism," according to Rabbi Andrew Baker's testimony to a U.S. Congressional human rights panel.

**Down to the Last One**

While so many in America are determined to wage war against white supremacy -- as well they should since it has resulted in two recent synagogue shootings, two mosque attacks, a Sikh temple shooting and an attack on an African-American church -- the ideology of Islamic supremacy has failed to draw the same level of open condemnation in the Western press. In a 2007 sermon, former Acting Speaker of the Palestinian Legislative Council Sheik Ahmad Bahr preached,

"You are the masters of the world on the face of this planet. Yes, [the Koran says that] 'you will be victorious,' but only 'if you are believers.' Allah willing, 'you will be victorious,' while America and Israel will be annihilated, Allah willing...Oh Allah, vanquish the Jews and their supporters. Oh Allah, vanquish the Americans and their supporters. Oh Allah, count their numbers, and kill them all, down to the very last one."

-- Sheik Ahmad Bahr, former Acting Speaker, Palestinian Legislative Council

"Down to the very last one" is in fact an Islamic extremist dog whistle. On July 21, 2017, Imam Ammar Shahin at the Islamic Center of Davis in California declared, “Oh Allah, count them [the Jews] one by one and annihilate them down to the very last one.”

On December 8, 2017, in protest of Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, the Imam of the Islamic Center of Jersey City, Sheikh Aymen Elkasaby, echoed the sentiment, "Count them one by one, and kill them down to the very last one. Do not leave a single one on the face of the Earth."

The same day, Imam Mohammad Qatanani of the Islamic Center of Passaic Country in Patterson,
New Jersey led a demonstration in New York's Times Square in which he said Israel's "time is up," and "We have to start a new Intifada!" sparking chants of "Intifada!" from the crowd. He went on to lead the crowd in chants of "Khaybar, Khaybar, Oh Jews. The army of Muhammad will return!" referring to Muhammad's Battle of Khaybar massacre of Jews in 628 AD.

Similar exhortations can be found in the social media messages of college students in America who are listed on the Canary Mission's anti-Semitic campus watch site.

A Fringe or Dominant Element?
Is the desire to annihilate Jews, Christians, America and Israel spread widely through the American Muslim community or is it an extremist fringe dwarfed in numbers by a vast majority of reasonable moderates? Muslims have been victimized by these extremist factions as much, if not more, than Christians, Jews and Westerners.

Of 26 attacks on worshipers cataloged by the Associated Press from 2010 through March 2019, 21 were Islamic-inspired, resulting in 1284 deaths and more than 1,000 wounded; (compared to 5 non-Islamic inspired attacks resulting in 92 deaths and more than 75 wounded). Of the 21 Islamic-inspired attacks, 15 of them targeted Islamic mosques and places of worship.

Many moderate Muslims fled their home regions long before 9/11 to embrace American freedom, and continue to do so to this day. Hidden in their midst are extremists who still seek to radicalize them and their 2nd and 3rd generation immigrant descendants in America, or persecute them if they convert to Christianity, or reject or speak out against fundamentalist Islam.

In 2016, at Hizb-ut-Tahrir America's annual Khilafa ("Caliphate") Conference in Illinois, Haitham Ibn Thbait explained, "this message [of Muhammad] is not here to integrate. It is here to dominate. Islam is here to dominate!" He encouraged abstinence from American democracy, telling the audience not to "fall into the electoral trap" by voting, or allow Obama to define what is "acceptable Islam." He continued, "They want to entice you and intimidate you into embracing their way of life. They want to change our Islam. We are not their puppets.

We are a cure and a mercy. We carry a comprehensive system of solutions for Mankind, and we should act accordingly. Muslims in the West are a part of this struggle. We should not underestimate our impact in this global effort. We need to be honest about who we are, what our global program is, and advocate for the system of Islam, wherever we may be...."


At the same conference last August, Ibn Thbait warned against the influence of moderates and stressed that Islam is in opposition to "liberal values," making specific mention of the LGBTQ community, feminists and other liberal movements. "[T]he battle between us and the West is an ideological battle...Everything we represent goes in total contradiction to what the West represents, because all of Islam is in opposition of secularism," he said.

"[T]his idea of fitting in -- we need to eliminate this from our vocabulary. Again, we are to stand out. We are a unique nation with a unique set of solutions. We are not to fit in...The only way to stand up against the state and its policies is by having your own state and its policies."

-- Haitham Ibn Thbait, Annual Khilafa Conference, Illinois, 2018

Last month, French President Macron shocked the world when he vowed an intractable fight against "political Islam," which he said wants to secede from the country. This comes after his two-year devotion to the goal of creating an "Islam of France" hit a dead end when a study for the project concluded that a radical form of Islam had a near monopoly across the country.
Worldwide policies that support mass migration must be weighed against the threat of Islamic supremacists. Inclusivity should take into consideration the safety of Christians, Jews, and those who choose a secular life, along with the moderate Muslims who’ve attempted to flee repressive regimes.

XVIII. Religion as Cause – or Antidote – to Extremism

Among the diverse perspectives on extremist violence, there are two divergent schools of thought on appropriate response. One maintains that religion-too-deeply-felt is at the heart of the problem and secular inclusiveness is the best path forward. The other holds that extremism is itself a spiritual problem and the most effective antidote is found in certain religious principles.

To be sure, terrible things have been done by people throughout history ostensibly in the name of religion, from the Spanish Inquisition and their New World Conquistadors to the Moorish advance into Europe, and from modern Islamic terrorism and repression, to modern white supremacists misleadingly labeled "Christian Identity.

The degree to which any of these negative examples are representative of the true religion, or politicized aberrations, is a matter of much debate. Christian Identity, for example, is described by Southern Poverty Law Center as "Christian' in name only." The FBI notes, "there are no ties between [Identity and fundamentalism] despite some similarities; there are significant differences, however. Foremost of these is racism." Identity uses Biblical passages to support a racist and anti-Semitic worldview, and avoids any emphasis on the teachings of Jesus Christ -- the one thing that defines being a Christian.

In fact, Identity is opposed to Christianity. The FBI links Identity to the white supremacist group The Order, a member of which wrote the White Genocide Manifesto in 1995 from prison (where he remained until his death in 2007). Author David Lane identified Judeo-Christianity as an enemy precisely because it is "dedicated to the concept of racial leveling" and "the oneness of mankind." Instead, Lane ascribed to neo-pagan beliefs popular in white supremacist circles.

The False Promise of No God

Nonetheless, in response to a perceived "religion problem," one strain of atheism, called New Atheism, has been embraced as a direct counterpoint to extremist violence, but it too can lead to extremist hatred of religious peoples. In 2016, Time magazine reported on the New Atheist attempts at inroads to the Muslim world. The movement holds that "every religion has negative consequences, and that even religious moderates contribute to the problem because, by affirming that faith is a legitimate reason to hold beliefs, they enable religious extremists." This wholesale condemnation of religion has limited appeal, Time admits: "The condescending speech of New Atheists—calling religious people delusional, for example—is not an effective cross-cultural strategy for generating change."

Atheism also presents a false promise of being so dispassionate that it is above violence. Atheistic states have been, and still are, some of the worst violators of basic human rights, with individual worth subsumed by whatever cause is deemed necessary by the state. Atheism has also been linked to extremist murderers, such as Devin Patrick Kelley, who killed 26 and wounded 24 people at Southerland Springs Baptist Church in Texas, and Craig Stephen Hicks, who killed 3 Muslims in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, as well as some school shooters, like Pekka-Eric Auvinen and Matti Saari in Finland.

An Existential Crisis

A diametrically opposite approach to extremism can be found in the ideas of Cardinal Robert Sarah, author of the new book, "Evening Draws Near and the Day is Nearly Over." The Canadian
Free Press reports, "According to Sarah, the stability of Christian Europe is indispensable for the peace and security of the world."

When asked by the Catholic Herald which problem poses the greatest threat to the West today, Sarah cited a "self-destructive hate" in Western culture. He answered, in part:

"The Church is the guardian of civilization. I am convinced that western civilization is passing at present through a mortal crisis. It has reached the extreme of self-destructive hate. As during the fall of Rome, elites are only concerned to increase the luxury of their daily life and the peoples are being anesthetized by ever more vulgar entertainment. As a bishop, it is my duty to warn the West! The barbarians are already inside the city. The barbarians are all those who hate human nature, all those who trample upon the sense of the sacred, all those who do not value life, all those who rebel against God the Creator of man and nature."

-- Cardinal Robert Sarah

This secularism in the West is a direct contributor to the popularity of radical interpretations of Islam. Cardinal Sarah, an African from the Muslim-majority nation of Guinea, noted, "Muslims despise the atheistic West. They take refuge in Islamism as a rejection of the consumer society that is offered to them as a religion. Can the West present them the Faith in a clear way? For that it will have to rediscover its Christian roots and identity."

Cardinal Sarah offers a legitimate warning to the West that a greater embrace of secularism and atheism is a dangerous response to Islam. The rejection of God and Christianity is also a dangerous response to those in Western culture who might be in crisis and inclined toward extremism. Extremist violence is a reflection of the view that certain lives are less than human and to be targeted for destruction, or without value and to be sacrificed in a quest for group justice or some cause perceived to be for the greater good.

An Antidote to Extremism

A rediscovery of Christian principles, if not of God, could help reduce violent extremism of all kinds. Both in striving to bring out the best in humanity -- through the promotion of mercy, compassion, forgiveness and love -- as in restraining man's worst impulses through the concept of sin, two millennia of Christianity have laid a foundation for the civility and tolerance that secularists rely on today.

Just as white supremacist David Lane objected, in the Christian worldview, all human life is sacred and all people are one in Christ -- children of God, perfect in creation, sinners in life, and destined for judgment by their creator for their deeds. That is no recipe for violence. It is a call for understanding.

Human life can and should be valued absent religion. Through the organization Value Up, Columbine survivor Craig Scott now promotes a message to schoolchildren around the country without overtly religious overtones, but still focusing on Christian principles of the equal and intrinsic value of every human life, compassion and kindness. Scott, a pastor's son, lost his sister Rachel at Columbine after she reportedly responded in the affirmative to Harris and Kliebold's questions on whether she believed in God.

For all their confidence in their own worldview, secularists still run the risk of extreme condemnation of the other -- and brutal violence -- without a satisfying alternative to those most fervent believers whom they seek to convert. To call for the sacrifice of all that religion has given mankind on the false promise of tolerant atheism is, in fact, extreme.

XIX. Battle Against Extremism is Politicized, Misdirected

The frequency of extremist violence should be of deep concern to all people. Nearly two decades
into the War on Terror, our best successes have been in thwarting plots, while progress in defusing the extremist mindset has languished. Even the fight against extremism has caused more people to misinterpret their fellow Americans as evil; the temptation to portray political opponents as extremists has simply been too strong.

Political Hate
"Are we headed for a new civil war?" is a question that has been asked and answered by news outlets across the country in the last two years, from the New Yorker to the Washington Post, and from Foreign Policy Magazine to MarketWatch and the Christian Science Monitor. A USA Today opinion columnist and others have argued it has already begun. Last month, the Washington Examiner published the results of a new Georgetown University "Battleground Civility Poll," that found, "More than half the likely electorate thinks we are more than 70% of the way to being at the edge of civil war."

Americans are reluctant to give any benefit of the doubt that their opponents are at least well-intentioned. In such a divided country, mass immigration, efforts to remove the president, and proposals to change the foundational structure of the government through electoral reform, relaxed voting laws or an expanded Supreme Court may be viewed as a move to reshape the country outside of democratic norms.

Alternatively, any and all efforts at radical change may be thought appropriate by those who believe the rhetoric that Trump and his supporters are literal Nazis. This worldview dehumanizes perceived enemies as much as any other form of bigotry, and contributes to political violence, civil rights violations, and hate crimes.

Bias Against the "Dominant" Group
Hate crimes against people who are in some way part of the presumed dominant group -- crimes that targeted straight, white, Christian or male individuals -- were 13 percent of all single-bias incidents in the FBI's most recent data. Only black Americans were targeted more, at 28 percent, with just over half of those offenses thought to be committed by white people.

In recent years, anti-white hate incidents included: in 2019, a string of anti-white pepper spray attacks in New York City; the 2017 Fresno shooting spree in which Kori Ali Muhammad targeted random white people after killing a security guard in Fresno because he said he wanted to be known for killing white people instead of being known for killing a security guard; a man who traveled from Texas to D.C. in 2017 threatening to kill all white police officers at the White House; the 2016 livestreamed torture in Chicago of a mentally disabled teen held captive for two days; the 2016 ambush of police officers in Dallas by Micah Johnson, who said he wanted to kill white people, especially white police officers; and the 2013 targeting of law enforcement in Los Angeles by Christopher Dorner, who wrote an anti-white, anti-Asian manifesto.

Modern "anti-racist" education encourages a negative view of white people at the same time that it inadvertently encourages some younger white people to believe more intensely in their own racial identity. Middle-aged and older white people have been better inoculated against such thinking thanks to past decades committed to teaching Dr. Martin Luther King's now-abandoned colorblind model that encourages judgement of individuals based on their character and deeds rather than their membership in any group.

The Prison Connection
The other most potent avenue into a pro-white, often anti-Semitic, worldview is through America's prison system. In 2016, the Anti-Defamation League reported,

"[W]hite supremacist prison gangs have been the fastest-growing segment of the white supremacist movement in the United States in recent years,"
accompanied by a related rise in crime and violence...For example, between 2000 and 2015, one white supremacist prison gang, the Aryan Brotherhood of Texas, was by itself responsible for at least 33 murders in communities across Texas."

-- Anti-Defamation League, 2016

It does no service to pretend that a prison problem is representative of the Republican party. Rather, it fails to address the root of the problem. The extent to which such gang membership is viewed to be necessary for self-defense -- or forced on inmates by the gang itself -- should be prioritized in extremist research.

Psychotropic Pharmaceutical Factor
Other high priority studies should be made on the potential connections between psychotropic drugs and mass shootings. In 2017, the Citizen's Commission on Human Rights International reported,

"Twenty-seven drug regulatory agency warnings cite psychiatric drug side effects of mania, psychosis, violence and homicidal ideation; 1,531 cases of psychiatric drug induced homicide/homicidal ideation have been reported to the US FDA; 65 high profile cases of mass shootings/murder have been committed by individuals under the influence of these drugs, yet there has never been a federal investigation into the link between seemingly senseless acts of violence and the use of mind-altering psychotropic drugs."

-- Citizen's Commission on Human Rights International, 2017

These high profile cases have resulted in 357 people dead and 336 wounded, CCHR said. Among the shooters reported to be under such pharmaceutical treatment are Stephen Paddock (Las Vegas concert), Nickolas Cruz (Parkland school), Alexandre Bissonette (Quebec mosque), and Eric Harris (Columbine school).

Mainstream and Social Media

Finally, both mainstream media and social media should be considered in the role they might play in contributing to extremist violence. The American Psychological Association put out a statement on the copycat phenomenon known as "media contagion" in 2016 saying, "People who commit mass shootings in America tend to share three traits: rampant depression, social isolation and pathological narcissism." It called on the media to deny such shooters the fame they seek.

For all the concern over radicalization online, there is little effort made to silence extremist violence rhetoric originating from left-leaning or radical Islamic social media accounts, and an inordinate effort to take down conservative accounts. Where real threats are concerned, censorship closes a useful window into the minds of potential assailants and may in fact trigger some people to more extreme real life action. Meanwhile, social media use itself has been linked to anxiety, depression, detachment from normal human interactions and violence. Cyberbullying and insulting online speech between strangers heightens the overall level of incivility in the country.

In the myopic drive to categorize non-jihadi extremist violence as "right-wing" or "white terror," multiple real threats are growing, related to partisan politics, "anti-racist" education strategies, prison gangs, psychotropic drugs, media coverage and social media participation. These real factors in extremist violence are unrelated to an ideology that advocates limited government or to the color of a person's skin.

XX. Dominant Terror Threat Narrative is All Wrong

The desire to blame ideological violence on one group or another reflects a quickness to condemn whole groups of people for the acts of individuals. Today, the dominant narrative is that right wing white men are the angriest and most dangerous threat to the country. That is simply not true.
The now oft-repeated statistics that purport to show the dangers of right wing terrorism rely on skewed data where individuals who are not right wing are classified as such; hate crimes and non-ideological murders are equated to mass-casualty terror attacks; left-affiliated violence is routinely overlooked; and the hate crimes, non-ideological murders, terror attacks and thwarted mass killing plots of Islamic extremists are under-counted.

**Fear of Patriots Misplaced**
A closer look at the white nationalist "threat" reveals the term is being used disingenuously to smear patriots whose desire for national sovereignty has nothing to do with bigotry. Likewise, those who extol the virtues of America or Western Civilization often do so not as a racist position, but in recognition of the best known system for securing human rights and equality under the law for all people. It is precisely for this achievement that immigrants are understandably drawn to the United States, where a Constitutional republic was conceived on Judeo-Christian principles to enact rights laid out in the Magna Carta, secured through English jurisprudence, and maintained through Greco-Roman democratic systems.

Even many white identitarians are not supremacists, but have chosen to adopt the leftist model of seeing themselves through the lens of race. They rightly refuse to accept guilt for the sins of the Democratic Party's past offenses of slavery and segregation, and choose to take pride in their heritage as is the sanctioned position for all other racial and ethnic groups.

**White, Black and Islamic Supremacists**
The actual violent extremists that threaten American peace and freedom today include both white and black supremacists who have taken the dangerous ideology of identity politics to its most extreme and intolerant conclusion, and Islamic supremacists who are part of a far larger coordinated effort to realize mass casualties. Together with the revolutionary communists of Antifa and civil war accelerationists, they are all America's political homeless who hold more in common with each other than with anyone in the mainstream right or left. Censoring these radical voices makes it more difficult to monitor them and carries risks of driving more people to take matters into their own hands through violence as the alternative to speech.

Understanding extremism requires an honest look at both terrorist incidents and hate crimes without the anti-white, anti-right bias apparent in the field of study today. The phenomena of hoaxes and online trolling must be weighed alongside actual incidents, many of which don't fit the desired model of straight white men attacking all other groups. Often the attackers come from other minority groups, and often people from the assumed dominant culture are victimized as well. Meanwhile, contributing factors in extremism, including psychotropic drugs, prisons, social media addiction and media coverage, are underappreciated.

**The Trump-Inspired Myth**
Americans on the left and very many on the right tend to grasp the concept of not holding individual Muslims to account for the terroristic acts of violent jihadis. That same standard is not granted to white people generally, or to Trump supporters, Republicans or right-leaning Americans specifically, even though the actual numbers of what are reported as "right wing" extremists are a tiny subset of those groups, and are wrongly classified as such in most cases.

In reality, multiple presumed Trump-inspired assailants were not Trump supporters (Brenton Tarrant and Jeremy Christian), or were expressly anti-Trump for his support of Israel (Robert Bowers and John Earnest). Moreover, most incidents categorized as "far right" in the latest data were non-ideological homicides, and many are better understood in terms of mental illness and/or are total aberrations from right wing ideology, having more in common with the far
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left than with the Right.

Understanding the Right

The modern American Right advocates Constitutionally limited government and promotes individual freedom, equality under the law, and meritocracy. Protection of citizens is considered the primary duty of government, and appreciation for those who serve the country toward that end in military and law enforcement capacities is very strong. Free enterprise -- as opposed to bureaucratic management -- is considered both morally and functionally to be the best way to manage the economy.

Conservatism in America is unique in the world in that it attempts to preserve the U.S. Constitution -- a historically unprecedented foundation for any country. Similarly, nationalism in America -- an extraordinarily diverse and freedom-oriented country -- is fundamentally different from that conceived decades ago by Nazi Germany. No where in right wing ideology is it held that one people are better than another, or that violence against civilians is justified for any cause.

Alternatively, the modern American Left advocates for varying degrees of government intervention to achieve particular social goals, be they related to health or welfare, environment or racial justice, or other objectives. The extreme of left wing ideology supports extensive governmental interference in the economy and society, does not tolerate dissenting perspectives or speech, and may even sanction political violence for some perceived great need, e.g., punching a "Nazi."

Whether willfully or not, the modern American Right has been broadly misunderstood and maligned in recent years. There is no good reason to fear patriotic Americans or declare the flag itself to be a hate symbol. Race, gender, religion, sexual orientation and origin of birth disappear at a Trump rally, where all parties happily recognize each other as Patriots. Far from divisive, Trump's vision of nationalism is a potential solution for healing the country, stripping away other labels and coming together as Americans. Any other interpretation is a misreading both of Trump and of the ideology of the Right.

Similarly, all distinctions between people disappear in the Christian worldview, as everyone is conceived to be a child of God -- perfect in creation, sinners in life, and destined to be judged in the end by a higher authority for his or her deeds. It is for this very reason that actual white supremacists denounce Christianity despite their perverse interest in using Biblical verses opportunistically at times to advance racist and anti-Semitic worldview.

The Disastrous Consequence of Modern "Anti-Racist" Education

The promotion of group identities by the Left is a dangerous path, but to the extent that it is taken, respect for all group identities should be applied equally, even for white, heterosexual, Christian, conservative and/or male Americans.

There is a better path, however, that the country once embraced with overwhelming success. The education system should reverse its modern "anti-racism" teachings that inspires racism by viewing all people through the lens of race. Instead, Americans should return to the tried and true teachings of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., that each and every person be judged by the content of his or her character and not by skin color -- or membership in any group.

Civility is a difficult thing to maintain in America today, where anonymous online communications are a daily part of many people's lives and instant media coverage holds vast influence over public opinion. To make any progress in reducing extremist violence, it is important to take an honest look at its character and causes. This research series aimed to do just that and is presented with the firm belief that America is not just worth fighting for -- she is worth coming together for as well.
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